

THE
SATURDAY REVIEW
OF
POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 1,422, Vol. 55.

January 27, 1883.

[Registered for
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

THE MURDER LEAGUE.

IT is difficult to imagine a more unprofitable occupation than arguing with those abettors of Irish anarchism who maintain that the revelations of FARRELL and the methods by which those revelations were obtained justify their own condemnation of a policy of coercion. Supposing this contention to be put forward in good faith, those who put it forward proclaim themselves to be as incapable of understanding as of forming an argument; and, supposing it not to be put forward in good faith, they are equally disqualified from receiving the attention they claim. All who have studied the history of Irish disaffection and Irish crime know perfectly well the progress, the symptoms, and the invariable treatment of its acute fits. To speak with a pointed bluntness, an Irish plot or conspiracy is never discovered till the informer makes his appearance, and the informer rarely makes his appearance till the gallows is steadily at work. The exceptions to this rule have almost invariably been cases in which the authorities employed false brethren to enter the conspiracy and so get at its secrets—a process more fruitful of results than agreeable to modern squeamishness. If the detection of the worst and innermost circles of the Land League and of Fenianism has been unusually slow, it is not because the Government has coerced, but because it has until recently coerced so languidly and with so little decision that its proceedings were of none effect. The hand was in many cases, as is now certain, laid upon the right persons in Mr. FORSTER's arrests of suspects; but the custody in which they were kept was too lax to do any good, and they were let loose again on the country in the incredible and criminal access of vacillation which cost Lord FREDERICK CAVENDISH and Mr. BURKE their lives. Meanwhile the greatest crimes were allowed to be committed with impunity, and while the salutary terrorism of the law was unexerted, the maleficent terrorism of the League was permitted full swing. In such case no rewards were likely to tempt informers. But now, by the action of the last few weeks, the balance has been set nearly straight again. The vigorous use of the rope has shown the less determined members of the conspiracy that danger does not lie altogether on the side of unfaithfulness to their accomplices; and the wholesale police raids (of which the Radical party in England has displayed such unqualified approval) have given plenty of material to work upon. It may be said in no spirit of bloodthirstiness or partisanship, but with the fullest confidence, that every time the black flag waves over an Irish prison it is a signal of life and rescue to hundreds of innocent men. It speaks the one language which is understood of the people to whom it is addressed.

It is impossible, of course, in the absence of corroboration to pronounce the evidence of FARRELL absolutely trustworthy. But there is nothing in it in the least improbable; it is consistent without having the suspiciously romantic consistency and picturesqueness of some such confessions; it tallies in many respects with things already known. Moreover, it derives, if anything, confirmation from the impudent demeanour of some of the accused persons, among whom the man CAREY, with his latest exploit of striking the Governor of Kilmainham, appears to be a very accomplished specimen of the kind of person to whom some good people are anxious to hand over the local government of Ireland. It was from the first suspected and almost known by well-informed persons that the

murder of Lord FREDERICK CAVENDISH and Mr. BURKE was in its particular circumstances almost what might be called accidental—that is to say, that it was an old plot directed against Mr. FORSTER, and kept perpetually ready for execution, but suddenly executed on another person because of the opportunity and encouragement given by the fool's paradise which followed Mr. FORSTER's resignation. Nor has any reasonable man ever supposed that the attacks on Mr. Justice LAWSON and on Mr. FIELD were mere isolated acts of individuals or unconnected groups. The existence of a party of intersection of the Land League and the old Fenian body has also long been a fact established by everything short of legal evidence, and the process of action which FARRELL describes is neither new nor surprising. More than a century of practice has made Irishmen very skilful organizers in such matters, though it almost always requires a period of lax government to bring such an organization into full activity. Lord SPENCER's vigour has apparently succeeded in getting a hold on the society less by the direct agency of detectives (though Mr. JENKINSON's Indian experience has doubtless been useful in that way) than by simply striking hard wherever there was an opportunity to strike. The execution of HYNES was doubly efficient in this way, coming as it did after a long period of impunity. It irritated the more daring spirits, and set them upon enterprises of danger like the attacks on the judge and the jurymen. At the same time, with the other executions which followed it, it struck terror into the less guilty or less enthusiastic members of the Assassination Society, and disposed them, when they were once in the grasp of the law, to take the chance with the risk of informing as against the apparent certainty of legal punishment. The operation is very simple; it would hardly need expounding if it were not persistently ignored by the whimsical amateurs in politics who play at backing revolution among us.

It is said that the authorities are in possession of plenty of evidence to corroborate FARRELL, and that they have a choice of approvers. The thing is by no means improbable, and FARRELL's own evidence explains the reasons of the probability. Carefully read, that evidence bears a remarkable stamp of truth in the way in which it explains the formation and growth of these Assassination Clubs. Everybody acquainted with things Irish (except one of the counsel for the defence, who apparently thought it was dead) knows that Fenianism is alive; and everybody who knows Fenianism knows that, while not on the whole acknowledging the propriety of assassination, the Fenians have always included an assassination section. Into this section FARRELL, like no doubt the majority of its members, was drawn almost by accident, and he remained a member of it under the usual influence of fear. The part of his evidence bearing on the action of JOHN DEVOR requires a little clearing up. FARRELL does not appear to have distinctly charged him with instigating assassination, and DEVOR has always borne the character of belonging to the more reputable section of Irish Irreconcilables; but it would certainly seem that he was in some way connected with the origin of the Assassination Club. However this may be, it is to be hoped that it is now near its end—at least its temporary end, for these things never die wholly. FARRELL asserts that some of the prisoners possess knowledge to which his is, by comparison, "a mite"; and at this knowledge the Government will have, if possible, to get. The problem in such a case, when once the tendency to inform

has set in, is to secure a sufficient number of witnesses and yet leave a sufficient number of examples. The chief agents of the Assassination Club, if they could be discovered, would be almost certainly found privy to the murders committed during the last three years in different parts of the country; and it is not impossible that the whole network of organization, a glimpse of which only was obtained during the Maamtrasna trials, might then be discovered and unravelled. In case of success, the most unsparing action will have to be taken. There is about this matter none of the varnish of false sentiment which led some presumably sane people to speak of the Manchester murderers as political prisoners. The inner circle to which FARRELL by his own account belonged does not seem to have been troubled about rescuing its friends, or even to have any definite and intelligible political aims. It existed and exists, as described, for purposes of pure assassination—for taking off Mr. FORSTER, who had not been officially responsible for the death of a single Irishman; for murdering or maiming judges or jurymen who simply did their duty ministerially, and the like. At the same time, though in the circumstances the Land League, by renewing active agitation, is directly responsible for this development of a Murder League, the sympathies of the latter appear to have been more than merely agrarian. Its acts, as they are depicted, exhibit in short that confusion of motives, partly agrarian, partly treasonable; which, as it has been steadily contended, has had during the events of the past two years and a half an increasing influence on the minds of Irish criminals. The desire for the landlords' land, and to exact vengeance for those who were punished for attempting to obtain that land in unrecognized ways, mixes itself up inextricably with the desire for separation from England, and becomes a simple murderous mania directed against any one of authority or position who represents law, order, and property. There are Land Leaguers who are not assassins; there are Fenians who are not assassins; but each Society tends to produce assassination, and when the two overlap, as they notoriously do, the tendency becomes far more vigorous. How to meet and check it is perfectly plain. The terror of the anarchist must be met by the stronger terror of the law. The Mallow election shows that the spirit of seditious opposition is as active as ever—that it is indeed more active than ever. There is nothing wonderful in this, and nothing very disquieting if the Government have the fortitude to pursue a vigorous policy. In pursuing that policy they may derive a little assistance from the Pope's recent letter, though the name of the Pope is not now a conjuring rod of much efficacy in Ireland, and though prelates of the CROKE and NULTY class can do much to neutralize what efficacy it has.

LORD HARTINGTON IN LANCASHIRE.

LORD HARTINGTON'S Lancashire speeches display both good sense and good taste, but they contain few interesting disclosures. It is natural that the second in rank of the Ministerial leaders should make a party speech; and if a work of supererogation was to be performed, it was desirable that the familiar topics should be treated in a moderate and rational tone. On the same day one of Lord HARTINGTON's youngest and least conspicuous colleagues was illustrating the mode in which political commonplaces could be treated in an opposite spirit. Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE thinks that the most urgent measure for next Session is the establishment of county government in Ireland for the purpose of modifying the present system, which he is pleased to call autocratic. The Leeds speech would not be worth mentioning but for the uncertainty which exists as to whom or what Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE represents, if he represents anybody but himself, or anything except his own crude speculations. The utterances of attendants or acolytes of the priestess at Delphi may have attracted a certain attention on the part of anxious visitors to the shrine; but judicious inquirers would wait to hear the official voice of the oracle. The PRIME MINISTER can scarcely be responsible for the statement that the Liberal party proposes to introduce constitutional government in India. It was perhaps hardly worth Lord HARTINGTON's while to boast of the present popularity of the Government. The existing state of political opinion is, in his judgment, the more gratifying because the promises of legislation which were made three years ago have not yet been fulfilled. The party of movement might perhaps have proved ungrateful if its aspira-

tions had been fully satisfied, whereas it now entertains a lively sense of favours to come. The Ministers can safely count on the support of the numerical majority which unfortunately desires organic changes in almost every existing institution. Lord BEACONSFIELD enjoyed in 1879 a still noisier popularity than that which now attends Mr. GLADSTONE; but the general approval was directed to his past diplomatic achievements, and it died away rapidly because he had nothing to promise for the future.

Lord HARTINGTON might well have left to partisans of the rank of Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE some unnecessary comments on the state of the Conservative party. His distinction between those whom he called old Tories and the Tory democracy, which consists of an unsuccessful candidate at a late election, is arbitrary and fallacious. The Opposition includes in its ranks a few undisciplined members, but its differences relate, not to principles, but to party tactics. Some subalterns think that their commanding officers are not sufficiently adventurous; but the official leaders and the occasional malcontents are equally bent on resisting the subversive policy of the Government. No two members of the Opposition are so much opposed to one another in opinion, in political temper, and in ulterior designs as some Cabinet Ministers among themselves. Mr. CHAMBERLAIN lately complained, almost in the words of LOUIS BLANC, that the expenses of the father of a large family were in proportion, not to his needs, but to his resources. The obvious inference, that it was the business of legislation to correct the inequalities of fortune, would assuredly not receive Lord HARTINGTON's assent. It is true that, as he said, the seceders from the Ministry still adhere to the Liberal opinions which they have always held; but the Duke of ARGYLL and the Marquess of LANSDOWNE utterly disapprove of the agrarian legislation which is apparently about to be applied to Great Britain, having just been tried as an exceptional remedy in Ireland. Even from the chief to whom Lord HARTINGTON gracefully expresses a loyalty at the same time genuine and profound, he is separated by more serious differences than those which may affect the relations of Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE and Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL.

By far the most important part of Lord HARTINGTON's speech at Bacup was his declaration that local self-government cannot be conceded to Ireland until the necessity of permanent union with Great Britain is generally and thoroughly recognized. He had already declared that Home Rule in its wider sense lies outside the region of discussion. It would be well if his colleagues and followers had always spoken with similar honesty and distinctness. It is evident that Lord HARTINGTON postpones to a remote period the consideration of the absurd project of committing the local business and revenues of Ireland to the charge of elected bodies. At the end of the last Session Mr. GLADSTONE persuaded himself and informed the House of Commons that there was no object which he was more anxious to accomplish than the establishment of local government in Ireland. He had some time before practically announced that Home Rule was an open question by inviting the obstructive party to propose some definite scheme, instead of the vague declamation to which they had hitherto confined themselves. It was thought excusable to prefer in a series of rhetorical flourishes a demand which was never likely to be conceded. Even Mr. BUTT's elaborate scheme was never seriously propounded, because in his time it had not occurred to any English Minister to tamper with the unity of the kingdom. Mr. SEXTON, who lately explained how his party would use the promised local organization, could easily, with the aid of his political associates, satisfy Mr. GLADSTONE's wishes by drawing up a plausible scheme of Home Rule. Lord HARTINGTON must have abandoned the professions which he made only last week if he consents to discuss any proposal of the kind.

Like the ATTORNEY-GENERAL, Lord HARTINGTON, while he proclaims the necessity of a redistribution of electoral districts, would gladly stop short of an arrangement by which political power will be exactly proportionate to the population. In this matter Lord HARTINGTON incurred a grave responsibility by pledging the party to a probably ruinous experiment when he was its regular leader. He then only undertook to extend household suffrage to the county constituencies; and perhaps he may not at the moment have foreseen the inevitable consequences of redistribution. The severest condemnation of both projects is to be found in Lord HARTINGTON's candid admission that any electoral change which can be devised will be injurious to

the Conservative party. On this occasion he refers not to the present Opposition, but to owners of property, to adherents of ancient institutions, and generally to the class which includes Lord HARTINGTON himself and half the present Ministry. The Liberal aristocracy, like the same class a hundred years ago in France, are, in the language of the old superstition, *fey*. The effect of doubling, and more than doubling, the present constituencies, and of giving exclusive electoral power to recipients of weekly wages, will be to disfranchise the upper and middle classes, and to leave corporate and private property without protection. It is probably on this ground that Lord HARTINGTON hopes to avoid absolute equality of representation, and to obtain an early settlement of the question on the reasonable ground that delay will probably lead to still more sweeping changes. When the measure is introduced, prudent politicians will support any limitation, however arbitrary and illogical, on the equal and universal representation of numbers; but the only defence of such anomalies must be the mischievous tendency of the measure as a whole. If the ATTORNEY-GENERAL represents the opinion of the Government, much more defensible securities against the supremacy of the populace are to be abolished, not because they are undesirable or useless, but, in the spirit of the French theorists whom BURKE denounced as metaphysicians, because there is to be only one franchise. On similar grounds, and indeed consistently with the general policy of the measure, the Universities are to be deprived of representation. Mr. DISRAELI was applauded by many of his ordinary opponents when he allotted members to the Universities of London, of Edinburgh, of Glasgow, of Aberdeen, and St. Andrews. Since that time political doctrines have ripened or rotted speedily. Academic bodies will undoubtedly not always share the opinions or passions of the mob. A faint protest against that tyranny of numbers which he has done much to accelerate, and a more definite reprobation of Irish Home Rule, are the only indications that Lord HARTINGTON, notwithstanding his moderate opinions, will resist the revolutionary policy of his most advanced colleagues. Even on a secondary question of legislative intervention in social economy he inclines to some form of local option. In default of a more relevant argument, Lord HARTINGTON deduces from the fall in the Excise revenue the paradoxical inference that temperance, because it is, according to popular belief, voluntarily practised, ought to be enforced. It is indeed highly improbable that the diminution in the consumption of alcoholic liquors exclusively represents a corresponding increase of sobriety. Some water-drinkers abstain from beer or spirits because they are afraid of their own weakness; while others make an easier sacrifice of luxuries to which they are comparatively indifferent. Popular agitation has no doubt produced an effect. Coercion by a direct or indirect popular vote would be unjust and oppressive. Lord HARTINGTON may perhaps think that the elected County Boards will be a better licensing tribunal than the justices; but there has been hitherto no authority for suppressing the sale of liquors. Sir WILFRID LAWSON and his supporters wish not to improve the licensing system, but to abolish licences. The holders of licences will be reasonably alarmed by Lord HARTINGTON's contention in his speech at Over Darwen that their property is only worth one year's purchase.

EGYPT.

LORD HARTINGTON has made the first authoritative statement of the Ministerial policy in regard to Egypt. All, or nearly all, that he said may be collected out of Lord GRANVILLE'S despatches; but he has been entrusted, in the absence of Mr. GLADSTONE, with the task of putting the intentions of the Government into a compact and, so far as circumstances permit, intelligible shape. The first and rudimentary idea which he invites the English public to grasp is that England is to do its work so well now that there will be no occasion for a fresh intervention hereafter. The work of England must, therefore, be one which shall permanently effect all the objects which the temporary intervention of England was designed to secure. The reasons for our sending an armed force to Egypt furnish in this way the key to the policy which is now to be pursued, and Lord HARTINGTON'S statement of these reasons really forms an important part of his statement of what is intended to be the future of Egypt. We interfered in Egypt, according to Lord HARTINGTON, for three

reasons. In the first place, we went there to protect interests which are specially English—our highway to India, and the investments of those of the QUEEN'S subjects who, on the invitation of former Egyptian Governments, have embarked their money in Egyptian enterprises. In the second place, we went there because Egypt is the first Mahomedan country which we touch on our road to India; and as in Egypt English subjects had been murdered and the honour of England imperilled, it was necessary to read a lesson to the Mahomedan world. Lastly, as Europe is sure to interfere in Egypt in one way or other for the protection of its different interests, it was desirable not only for England but for all Europe that the protection of these interests should be confided to the care of a single responsible Power. England will discharge this office alone, because if she shared her powers she could not exercise them properly, and she will so exercise them as to discriminate between those interests of foreigners which are legitimate and those which are illegitimate. She will see that the persons and property of all Europeans are respected, and that the international engagements of Egypt are fulfilled, but she will guard Egypt against the insidious overtures of European financiers. That this salutary result of our intervention in Egypt shall be attained, England makes herself responsible to all the Powers. She announces that her troops will be kept in Egypt until it is attained; she demands, rather than requests, that there shall be no interference with her while she is working out her purpose; but she solemnly pledges herself to see that the Egypt of the future shall never give any European Power a reasonable cause of complaint. England, for her own purposes, wants a good Government in Egypt; she wants to secure her highway to India and to protect the interests of British investors in Egypt; she also wishes to give the Mahomedan world a signal proof of her power and influence in a Mahomedan country; but she also undertakes that the Government she sets up shall, as regards Europe, do all that it ought to do.

It is much more important to comprehend the purposes which the new order of things is to fulfil than to criticize the particular means by which the English Government is endeavouring to accomplish these purposes. These purposes furnish the standard by which the details of the new administration are to be tested. When any novelty is proposed, we have now to ask whether it tends to protect our highway, to impress Mahomedans, to enable us to make good our guarantee of the good behaviour of Egypt. Lord HARTINGTON was altogether silent as to that prudent development of Egyptian institutions which sometimes appears as a prominent part of the Ministerial programme. His reticence was perfectly intelligible. He may have been struck with the oddity of giving off-hand to Egypt what shortly before he had said could not possibly be given to Ireland. But at any rate the development of Egyptian institutions is necessarily, to Lord HARTINGTON, a secondary object. He has first to devise a Government that will enable us to fulfil our guarantee, and the development of Egyptian institutions is only one of many means by which this primary object may possibly be attained. Mr. GOSCHEN filled up the blank which Lord HARTINGTON had left. The institution of local self-government in Egypt was very precious in his eyes. It was specially dear to him as a Liberal, and as a Liberal addressing Liberals. He even found in this zeal for local self-government the real justification of the abolition of the Joint Control. We cannot join France in governing Egypt, because we should regard with pleasure, while the French would regard with aversion, the introduction of some kind of self-government into a Mahomedan country. And Mr. GOSCHEN appealed to what is now going on in India to show that England practises what she preaches. There we are doing already what it is hoped we shall soon do in Egypt. We are endeavouring in India to solve what Mr. GOSCHEN called the tremendous and difficult problem how the subject races can be governed while, at the same time, a certain amount of national life is allowed. In India a century has been spent in teaching the subject races that England governs them, and now it is a tremendous and difficult problem how what Mr. GOSCHEN judiciously calls a certain amount of national life can be allowed them. In Egypt the problem seems rather to be how we can avoid giving the subject race much more than this certain amount of national life before we have made them feel that England is governing them, sometimes

directly and always indirectly. It is not fair to press Mr. GOSCHEN's parallel too closely, and to take him to mean that what is true of India is precisely true of Egypt. What he meant is that some modest form of self-government, some faint beginning of national life, in Egypt is a good thing in itself, and is compatible with the attainment of our own objects and the fulfilment of our European guarantee. This is quite true; but the real difficulty of the Government is not to show it to be true and to act on what it shows. Its real difficulty is in imposing its policy on its supporters. In itself this policy is good. It is in harmony with English traditions and English interests. But it may be safely said that only a tiny fragment of the Liberal majority would ever have guessed, until Mr. GLADSTONE told them, that England ought to interfere to protect British investors and read Mahomedans a lesson; that England would be wise in giving a European guarantee for the permanent good government of Egypt; and that "Egypt for the Egyptians" may be properly boiled down into the concession of such an amount of modest self-government as is compatible with the fulfilment of this guarantee.

The Joint Control has been formally abolished by an edict of the KHEDEVE, and the French Controller has left Cairo, after a protest on the part of the French Government to the effect that it cannot recognize the right of Egypt, after having undertaken that there shall be a French Controller, to abolish the position of a French Controller without the consent of France. As between Egypt and France the argument is unanswerable; but every one is aware that it is not Egypt, but England, that abolishes the Joint Control, and that the arrangement between Egypt and France is abruptly terminated because it is not consistent with the policy of England that it should any longer endure. In lieu of the Control, the Egyptian Government is to have an English financial adviser, and this financial adviser is to be the late English Controller. Lord HARTINGTON seems to think it very hard on the English Government that the French persist in saying that this is to abolish the Joint Control, and to create an exclusively English Control. The French say this, and will continue to say it, because it is obviously true. The English financial adviser is to do exactly what a Controller would do, neither more nor less. He is to offer advice on every financial subject, and there is no possible act of the Egyptian Government, except the routine work of departments, which is not within the sphere of a financial adviser. The financial adviser will protect the interests of all European Powers, and not of England only; but this is exactly what the Controllers were meant to do. They were to see that Egypt was so governed that the obligations of the Law of Liquidation, which was accepted by the Powers generally, were strictly fulfilled. When the financial adviser gives good advice, he will be supported by England. If he has this support, his advice will be instantly taken; if he has not this support, he will have no more influence with the Egyptian Government than the first man in the streets. It seems much simpler to say that the existence of an official called Financial Adviser, or Controller, or anything else, is a necessity of the situation. If England and France were jointly guiding Egypt there would be two such officials; as England alone is guiding Egypt, there is only to be one. The diplomatic representative of England cannot do the large amount of work which the superintendence of Egyptian administration demands. He can discuss and, under the direction of the Foreign Office, decide the larger questions which may arise; but he cannot thrash out the materials for a decision, and get these larger questions ready for a solution. Smaller questions he must leave to be decided by an Englishman whom he can trust. What he wants is, therefore, a competent chief of the guidance department; and Sir EDWARD MALET could not have a better subordinate in this honourable and confidential capacity than Sir AUCKLAND COLVIN.

THE FRENCH PROSCRIPTIONS.

IF Prince NAPOLEON's object in putting out his Manifesto was his own glorification, he has certainly been disappointed. The controversies arising out of his sudden return to politics have become fiercer every day, but every day they have had less to do with their nominal author.

Had the position of the party been more fortunate, the visit of the Empress EUGÉNIE to Paris ought to have gone a long way towards healing their discords. No one has hated Prince NAPOLEON more heartily than the Empress EUGÉNIE; and if she can consent to see in her adversary of past years only a martyr to the principle of Imperialism, even M. PAUL DE CASSAGNAC can hardly any longer reject him as his chief. There is something so disheartening, however, in the universal agreement to treat the Prince as of no account, that this recognition of him by the one personage who, of all others, might have been expected to repudiate him, seems to have alarmed the Bonapartists rather than cheered them. The Empress EUGÉNIE had hardly entered Paris when she left it; and, for any good her visit did to the prisoner's prospects, she might as well have stayed in England. If, on the other hand, Prince NAPOLEON's purpose was simply to show how little faith Republicans have in the stability of the Republic, it must have been answered beyond his expectations. Neither friends nor enemies could have foreseen the frantic alarm into which the mere hint of a conspiracy against the existing order of things has thrown the politicians who have been most persistent in declaring that the existing order of things is too firmly established to be ever again overthrown. Why the publication of Prince NAPOLEON's Address should have had the effect of turning all eyes on the ORLEANS Princes is not clear. They have been as much before the world any time this ten years as they are now. Their attitude towards the Republican Government has undergone no change, nor have the disabilities imposed on them by family circumstances been in any way lessened. If the Count of CHAMBORD had died or abdicated, there would have been some excuse for the present panic. Remote as the prospect of a Restoration might still have been, it would not have been the sheer impossibility that it must be so long as the wearer of the crown would be HENRY V. But nothing of the kind has happened. So far as external conditions go, the Republic is as secure to-day as it was on the morrow of the victory over Marshal MACMAHON. There are differences, indeed, and great differences, between its position then and its position now, but they are not differences with which the ORLEANS Princes are in any way concerned. Whatever change there is has been entirely the work of Republicans.

This sudden access of terror at the self-evolved thought of an Orleanist assault upon the Republic is perhaps to be explained by the mutual distrust of the Government and the Extreme Left. The Extreme Left profess to believe that every Republican who even calls himself moderate—whether he has any title to the name does not matter—is no better than a Royalist in disguise; while the Government are uneasy lest every apparent want of energy on their part should be taken to justify the suspicion. M. FLOQUET's Bill may thus have been designed to either unmask or commit the Cabinet. If they opposed it they could be denounced as traitors, to whose hands the fortunes of the Republic must not be trusted an hour longer. If they accepted it they would disgust their moderate supporters and must necessarily reinforce themselves from the Extreme Left. The Government were seemingly not unconscious of the trap laid for them, and, with the peculiar adroitness which is seldom wanting to weakness, they tried to find a middle course between the alternatives offered them by M. FLOQUET. They would not hear of anything so violent as banishing the Princes of ORLEANS in a body; but they were equally determined not to leave them under the protection of the laws which apply to all French citizens. They preferred to make them a class by themselves, and to subject them to special disabilities and special supervision. The Ministerial Bill proposes that the President of the Republic shall be empowered to require any one of them to withdraw from the territory of the Republic if his presence in it shall compromise the security of the State; and that, in the event of the exile's returning without the leave of the Government, he shall be imprisoned for from one to five years, and then again put across the frontier. The statement with which this Bill is prefaced opens with a singularly unfortunate sentence. "The Republic is 'certainly strong enough to allow itself to be discussed 'with entire liberty; but it would not be a Government 'if it had not the right or if it were wanting in the duty 'of self-defence.' Discussion which is entirely free, and yet cannot allow Prince NAPOLEON to say that what a plébiscite has done only a plébiscite can undo, has at least the merit of novelty, and the duty of self-defence can scarcely

become imperative until a cause for self-defence has arisen. If the Government had proposed to banish Prince NAPOLEON by way of punishment for his manifesto their conduct would have been intelligible, though it might have been unwise; but why are the ORLEANS Princes to be banished in self-defence against an attack in which they have borne no part, and coming from a quarter with which they have no sympathy? If the object of the Bill had been to provide a common ground on which all opponents of the Republic could meet without compromising their special convictions, the Government could not have managed matters more neatly. But for the proposed legislation the Orleanists would necessarily have been on the same side with the Republic, since Prince NAPOLEON's success would injure both equally. By proposing to visit the two families with a common penalty the Ministers have united the friends of both in a common hostility to the Republic which is thus indiscriminating in its proscription.

It might have been thought that even in the blind terror to which so many of the Extreme Left and of the advanced section of the Republican Union have lately been victims, the authors of the amnesty to the Communists would have been ashamed to talk of banishing the ORLEANS Princes. The argument most commonly urged in support of M. FLOQUET'S Bill is that the "pretenders" have never formally disclaimed their position as members of the Royal House of France. In the case of the pardoned Communists there was not even the implied waiver of their claims that there has been in the case of the Princes of ORLEANS. The Communists returned from exile or penal servitude without a single expression of regret for the past or a single promise of good behaviour for the future being asked of them. In some cases they frankly declared that whenever the opportunity recurred they were ready to do again what they had done in 1871. Not indeed that it would make any difference if the ORLEANS Princes had expressly disclaimed any benefits that can come to them by a restoration. According to another theory, the more innocent a pretender seems the more dangerous he really is. Prince NAPOLEON is of no importance because he has placarded Paris with his pretensions. The Princes of ORLEANS cannot be tolerated in the country because they go about their own business and do not meddle with politics. Besides, it is argued, the worst that we ask the Republic to do them is something infinitely less than it has done to the miners of Montceau or the anarchists of Lyons; yet these last had not tried to upset the Republic, they had only sought to bring the Government of the Republic more into conformity with their own views. It is useless of course to remind men who reason in this way that the substance of government is more important than its form, and that the man who labours to make a Republic anarchical is a danger to society in quite a different sense from any in which the term can be used of a man who tries to convert a Republic into a Monarchy. The one is necessarily, and at all times, a public enemy; the other is so only under certain circumstances. The practical difference, however, between the two cases is that whether the intentions of the anarchists were good or bad they did not leave them to be guessed at. They had earned their punishment by something in the nature of overt acts. If they had not themselves resorted to dynamite, they were affiliated to societies which both preached and practised the use of it. There is nothing parallel to this in the case of the Princes of ORLEANS. If they nourish any designs against the Republic, it is in the secret of their own hearts. It is assumed by those who wish to proscribe them that men who come of their stock must be conspirators; but not the faintest evidence has been brought forward to show that they are conspirators. The precedent that will be set by constructing a class of banishable persons on the strictly *a priori* method may easily be carried a great deal further. If the Princes of ORLEANS and the members of the BONAPARTE family are to be sent out of the country, not because they have been proved to be conspirators, not even because they are reasonably suspected to be conspirators, but simply because they are of the stuff of which conspirators are made, why should not the process be extended to all their supporters? What is sauce for a BONAPARTE is sauce for a Bonapartist. It does not matter whether a man would like to see himself or another man on the throne; he may equally labour to upset the Republic which stands in the way. Every convinced Royalist is a king-maker in will, if not in deed; why should not he be sent to join the men on whom he would

like to exercise his art? More than this, why should the Republic stop at banishment when it has in its hands so much more effective a penalty? Exiles may come back, and then the labour of banishing them may go for nothing. It is only the dead that never return; it is in executions, not in decrees of banishment, that the safety of the State must be looked for. Whenever it is proclaimed that a man may be punished for what he is, and not for what he does, the principle that gave France the Terror will have been accepted by the Third Republic.

MR. GOSCHEN AT RIPON.

MR. GOSCHEN'S speech at Ripon is not a little disappointing to those who may have hoped that one eminent member of the Liberal party was opposed to the spirit of threatened legislation. He still retains his objection to the establishment of a uniform franchise, but on all other points he is prepared to give an unqualified support to the Government, and he is careful to minimize the only difference by which he is separated from his former colleagues. If he adheres to his present opinions and intentions, it was hardly worth while to make the sacrifice, whether large or small, which was involved in his refusal of office. Mr. GOSCHEN strangely pledges himself to vote for any Government measure relating to land, even if the predatory Bill of the Farmers' Alliance receives Ministerial sanction. He must know that Mr. JAMES HOWARD proposes to prohibit any voluntary agreement for the adjustment of rent, and that in a late speech he denounced the custom as well as the law of primogeniture, with the obvious purpose of abolishing the right of owners to dispose of their property by will. When agrarian agitators demand fixity of tenure they profess to attribute all improvements to the tenant. In denouncing primogeniture they make the opposite assumption, that the landlord is bound to provide the means of improvement. Mr. GOSCHEN might well have disconnected himself from a faction which is only less unscrupulous than a Trades-Union Congress. If such iniquities are to be perpetrated by the present Parliament, it might at first sight seem useless to resist the constitutional changes which are to remove all checks on the caprice of pure democracy. Mr. GOSCHEN indeed is not prepared to concur with the Trades-Union delegates in summarily confiscating the whole of the land; but even for their lawless cupidity he is ready to make the lame excuse, that some of them had left the meeting before the resolution was proposed. It appears from a letter published by a delegate who calls himself Secretary of the Amalgamated Cab-Drivers' Association, that Mr. GOSCHEN has been misinformed. The shameful resolution of which he speaks was passed in a full meeting by an absolute majority of the Congress. It is of the class represented by the delegates that Mr. GOSCHEN repudiates all political distrust. If Mr. GOSCHEN'S language is to be literally understood, he will only stop short of wholesale spoliation. It may be hoped that his future action will be more moderate than his speech.

It is easy to understand Mr. GOSCHEN'S anxious disclaimer of disloyalty to the Liberal party. He will not coalesce with the Opposition, though he will, if he has the opportunity, render it powerful support on questions incomparably more important than any issue which divides moderate Liberals from Conservatives. Only a strong conviction can explain his refusal to join his political allies in the most suicidal and unscrupulous of their attacks on the Constitution; and there is reason to fear from one passage in Mr. GOSCHEN'S speech that he may perhaps, through an overstrained scruple, shrink from discharging the painful duty which he was supposed to have fully recognized. He promises that he will remit to his constituents the decision whether he is after all to oppose the proposed revolution. The electors of Ripon deliably chose Mr. GOSCHEN as their member long after he had announced his disapproval of an equalization of the franchise. It is probable that many of them may have wished that he would overcome his objections, while others may perhaps not regard with perfect complacency the impending disfranchisement of their ancient borough. All his supporters practically resolved that it was better to be represented by an able and upright statesman than to choose a delegate in the person of some docile partisan. If Mr. GOSCHEN tenders his resignation, and if at the instance of the

central Liberal managers it is accepted, he will scarcely be acquitted of dereliction of a duty which in one sense was self-imposed. Even the advocates of obedience to the orders of constituencies would perhaps admit that in each Parliament an irrevocable mandate is given once for all. If Mr. GOSCHEN retains his seat in Parliament till the household suffrage Bill is passed, he will almost certainly be invited to take office in the Liberal Government, and some readers of his late speech may conjecture that he already looks forward to the contingency without dissatisfaction; but after the degradation of the franchise will come the more sweeping measure of redistribution, involving a new and greater violation of the principles which Mr. GOSCHEN defends. He professes not to distrust the political character of the constituency to be created on the basis of uniform household suffrage; but he rightly protests against the transfer of all political power to a single class. The extension of the borough franchise to the counties, though its effects will be gravely deleterious, will still leave untouched some of the peculiarities which respectively distinguish urban and rural communities. The further establishment of approximately equal electoral divisions will go far to obliterate the differences between town and country. A monotonous government by local Caucuses will take its instructions from some central body; and all classes except those which live on weekly wages, with the sycophants and demagogues who flatter and rule them, will be permanently excluded from political influence, and eventually from public life. To results like these Mr. GOSCHEN will be assuredly opposed; and perhaps it is hardly worth guessing what may be the condition and mutual relations of parties when the Whigs have buried themselves and their Conservative adversaries in the ruins of the constitutional temple.

Dissentients and converts are often most zealous in their adhesion to a creed at the moment when they begin to suspect it of error. Lord HARTINGTON might, if he had not confined his remarks to seceders from the present Cabinet, have added Mr. GOSCHEN to the list of faithful Liberals who have only separated from the congregation of the faithful on some isolated scruple. Political judgments on special issues seldom stand alone. The Duke of ARGYLL will never again heartily sympathize with a party which for its own ends tampers with the security of landed property. Mr. GOSCHEN cannot seriously doubt that the promoters of numerical supremacy will concede all the remaining demands of the greedy multitude. Ninety years have passed since the Whig ancestors of modern Liberals became conscious of a rift in their union among themselves. BURKE for a time stood alone among his party in denouncing the principles of the French Revolution. His most attached friends then complained of his irritable temper, of his rashness, and of his premature rupture with SHERIDAN, and afterwards with FOX. A year or two later the great majority of the party formally coalesced with PITT; and it was facetiously asserted that the remaining Opposition went home from the House in two hackney coaches. There is no reason to hope for a similar result when the Whigs of the present day understand too late the follies which they are now committing; but when they have disarmed themselves and their social equals, they will perhaps retire from an unnatural combination. Mr. GOSCHEN will have the credit of having been the first to secede, though he now repudiates with sensitive earnestness the initiative which was once assumed by BURKE. When he first announced his dissent from the project of a uniform franchise, he assigned as a reason for distrusting popular judgment his belief that the working classes preferred sentiment to political economy. The Trades-Union delegates who propose at the same time to nationalize the land and to substitute promiscuous outdoor relief for the work-house test can perhaps hardly be called sentimental, but they are dangerously selfish. Mr. GOSCHEN will not agree with a section of Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S constituents which objects to the disfranchisement of paupers. It is to his credit that he foresees the tendency of household or universal suffrage to place all property under the control of those who have none. His readiness to hand over to the farmers a portion of the property of their landlords conflicts in principle with his economic doctrines; but it is injudicious to insist that a statesman should be consistent when half his opinions are sound. If he were compelled to renounce some articles of an eclectic and contradictory creed, his choice might possibly be wrong. On fuller consideration

Mr. GOSCHEN may perhaps retract the assertion that it is for the public interest to obtain the largest amount of produce from the land. Mr. JAMES HOWARD, with the fluent confidence becoming a demagogue, lately declared that the produce of the country might be increased by fifty or a hundred millions sterling. To an orator of his class the difference of fifty millions between the two amounts matters little. It is not impossible that at an enormous cost the produce of the land might be increased by a fourth or a third. The proportion of the gross return to the cost of production, or, in other words, the profit, is in agriculture as in commercial undertakings the test of private and public benefit. There is no reason to believe that a Land Bill will increase by a fraction the net returns, which are already larger than in any other country in the world. The proposals which Mr. GOSCHEN too hastily approves are intended to alter, not the total amount, but the distribution of profit between occupier and owner. It is perhaps natural that the large farmers before they are swamped by the enfranchised labourers should wish once for all to turn their political power into money. In the next Parliament their support will not be worth buying. They will then perhaps invoke Mr. GOSCHEN'S aid to protect them against an enacted scale of wages.

THE MINISTERIAL CRISIS IN FRANCE.

FRENCH Ministers must be pretty well accustomed by this time to positions in which their dignity can be maintained with difficulty; and unwillingness to make any further appearances of this kind may have kept M. DUCLERC and his colleagues away from the bureaux which met on Tuesday to elect the Committee on the rival measures of proscription. But even in France a Cabinet has seldom been called on to make so humiliating a confession as that involved in the reason given for their absence. Eight Ministers, including the MINISTER of the INTERIOR and the MINISTER of JUSTICE, have seats in the Chamber of Deputies; but not one of them attended in his place. The Cabinet had met earlier in the day, to agree upon the line which each should take in the bureau to which he belonged. It then appeared that the differences between them were too great and too incapable of being smoothed away to make it possible for them to take, as a Cabinet, any line at all. It must be supposed that they had been originally agreed in supporting the Bill introduced by the Government by way of amendment to M. FLOQUET'S proposal. But in the interval the majority of the Ministers had satisfied themselves that the Government Bill did not go far enough to command the assent of the Chamber. The clause which they thought specially insufficient was the one which provided that the ORLEANS Princes, now serving in the French army and navy, may be placed on the retired list. MM. BALLUE and LOCKROT had proposed to substitute clauses depriving them of the rank given them by former Governments and by the National Assembly under the existing Republic, and the majority of the Ministers had by this time convinced themselves that this proposal ought to be accepted by the Cabinet. To this surrender General BILLOT and Admiral JAURÉGUIBERRY declared themselves altogether opposed, and M. DUCLERC was at once confronted by the prospect of losing his Ministers of War and Marine, unless he chose to avert it by sacrificing all his remaining colleagues. Whether M. DUCLERC himself had any decided opinion on the point raised is not clear; but he seems to have a very decided opinion indeed upon the retirement of General BILLOT. Even under the best of all possible Republics it is well not to quarrel with the army, and a Minister of War who resigns rather than consent to see officers dismissed the service for purely political reasons is likely to command a large measure of professional sympathy. If every promotion in the army is liable to be reviewed any number of years afterwards in the light of the political ideas that have come into being since, professional rank will be one of the least secure of earthly goods. At present it is only proposed to turn men out of the army because they are the descendants of kings, but the principle may be easily extended to other classes. Nor indeed is there any evident reason why it should be limited to any one description of rank. If to be hereditarily well affected towards the Republic is an indispensable condition of retaining a place among officers of the army or navy, it

may with at least equal force be made a condition of retaining a place among magistrates. The general sense of insecurity which has for some time past been growing up among the professional classes will be immeasurably increased by the proscription of the ORLEANS Princes. The fate which is theirs to-day may be the fate of thousands more in a year or two.

The debates in the bureaux having no Ministers to guide or moderate them were extremely violent, and the minority which opposed both the Bills were told with great plainness that they would be regarded as accomplices of the conspirators. This threat did not prevent some of the moderate Deputies from speaking their minds with equal frankness. The Extreme Left, said M. RIBOT, hope to terrify the Moderates by the accusation of Orleanism. That is the old game of the Extreme Left. If we concede proscription to-day, we shall be asked to concede something more to-morrow. The question really raised by these Bills is whether we are to have a Radical or a Moderate Republic, and on that issue the fight had better be taken sooner than later. Here and there a Radical Deputy was found to stand up against proscription, but he usually made things straight with his party by supporting all the more strongly the proposal to deprive the ORLEANS Princes of their military rank. The result of the voting in the bureaux was the appointment of a Committee in which M. FLOQUET's friends had a majority, and on Thursday this Committee agreed to a Bill in which are incorporated all the most violent proposals that have been made in their most violent form. The soil of France, Algeria, and the colonies is forbidden to all members of families which have reigned in France. Such persons shall enjoy no political rights, nor shall they in any capacity form part of the French army; and at elections ballot-papers bearing their names shall be treated as null. This last provision is characteristically impudent. Deputies who live by the breath of universal suffrage try to limit the action of universal suffrage in the future. They cannot conquer an uneasiness which, after all, does credit to their self-knowledge. They feel that France will not long endure the yoke they are about to impose on her, and that one of the methods which she chooses to throw it off may be to make at a future election a species of informal plébiscite in favour of some one of the persons who are now to be banished. Consequently the Republic is to be debarré by anticipation from choosing its own master. Only the votes which go to confirm the Radical usurpation will be counted as valid. The device hardly rises above the commonplace. The moment that the French people are sufficiently unanimous to make it essential to suppress the record of their votes, they will find other ways of making their wishes prevail. Such is the measure that will be presented to the Chamber to-day. Whether by that time there will still be a DUCLEUC Ministry it is at the moment of writing impossible to say. M. DUCLEUC may have accepted General BILLOT's resignation or the resignation of his other colleagues, or have resigned himself. Any one of these incidents is possible, though the second is very much the least probable of the three. M. DUCLEUC may think that the Minister who undertakes to carry on a struggle with the Chamber ought to be a stronger man, and one who commands more public confidence, and it is likely enough that this view is shared by the PRESIDENT of the Republic. If M. DUCLEUC decides to accept General BILLOT's resignation, he will probably make some feeble effort to amend the Committee's Bill in his own sense; and on this proving vain he will perhaps resign. If he does not resign, the victorious majority will no doubt make an early opportunity of defeating the Ministry. M. DUCLEUC is hardly the man to force the proscription Bills through a reluctant Senate, or to abolish the Senate, supposing it to refuse to pass them; nor is there any reason why, when M. CLÉMENTEAU and his party have both the will and the power to take office, they should subject themselves to any self-denying ordinance.

The Paris Correspondent of the *Times*, who is always given to hero-worship, and is now rather poorly provided with idols, tries to make out that M. FERRY is the coming man. If by the coming man is meant the coming-in man, this expectation is likely enough to be fulfilled. M. FERRY is usually somewhere about when there is a Cabinet to be constructed, and relatively to the men who compose the present Government he is known in the country. But to suppose that M. FERRY will have the

resolution to fight what in the first instance, if not ultimately, must be a losing battle is to credit him with more solid qualities than he has yet shown himself to possess. It is only fair, however, to admit that the position of a leader of Moderates at the present time in France is neither enjoyable nor hopeful. In the Chamber he will find himself a general without an army, and though he will have abundance of well-wishers in the country, it is extremely doubtful whether these well-wishers will also be supporters. According to the *Times*' Correspondent, M. FERRY has only to appeal to the country to win a triumphant majority, and thus reassure France and consolidate the Republic. It is by no means clear, however, that the author of this prediction is himself a believer in it. If he were, why should he be afraid, as he evidently is, that M. FERRY will prefer to "figure among the flatterers of 'popular passions'?" So shrewd a politician does not reject the chance of reassuring France and consolidating the Republic by the agreeable process of winning a triumphant majority for himself, unless he sees reason to think that the chance is a purely imaginary one.

ELECTION EXPENSES.

THE dispute which has just taken place as to the apportionment of the legal expenses of the last Liverpool election is worth a good deal more attention than it is likely to receive, unless that attention is expressly directed towards it. The facts disclosed are very significant in themselves, and they have been made more significant by the singular ineptitude of the comments which have been passed on them in the *Times*, the only London paper which has reported them fully. It is, of course, a quite intelligible thing that the mechanical arrangements of a newspaper which furnish it with news should continue to work more or less profitably after the ability to make use of them at headquarters has disappeared. But a more striking proof of this has not been recently produced. The facts of the dispute are to any one who considers political matters with intelligence, and from any other than a Radical point of view (and the *Times* has not yet declared for Radicalism) full of warning. Liverpool has, if not the largest register in the kingdom, at any rate the largest which is not manipulated by one political party exclusively. Its last election was a typical election in this respect, that its result has left hardly any soreness of feeling in critics whose interests are not local. Tories have consoled themselves for it amply by the reflection that a supporter weighted with such pledges as Mr. FORWOOD's would have been much more damaging than an opponent weighted with such pledges as Mr. SMITH's; and Liberals have had their triumph tempered by the reflection that Mr. SMITH, supposing him to be faithful to his promises, is about as practical a politician, and about as much to be counted on as if he had been a Tichborneite or a Lost-Tribesman. No personal or partisan consideration thus enters into the debate, which has indeed been conducted by both candidates in common, an incident in which it might be wrong to see an additional proof of the proposition that there was little or nothing to choose between them. The facts are simply these. The Ballot Act and its amending statutes allow a certain expense, and it has been found in Liverpool that rapidity and certainty of result are not to be attained without spending more. Where the Act allows three guineas to presiding officers Liverpool allows four; where the Act proposed something like two score counting clerks, Liverpool employed more than seven score. A surcharge of some hundreds of pounds has thus arisen which it is proposed to meet by an appropriation of Corporation funds. The reflections suggested to a writer who is allowed the dignity of large type in the *Times* are—that the facts illustrate "the desperate efforts of Parliament to keep down the expenses of elections," that they are "justly pointed to as a proof that the Ballot Act is unnecessarily parsimonious," and that the main thing is that an election in a large constituency "should be got through rapidly, and without friction."

Such a display of *bêtise* as this may not unnaturally suggest the question whether the gods have already gone through the process (preliminary, as is well known, to another process) of dementing the English people. From

the tone in which the writer in the *Times* speaks of the matter, nobody who had not given special attention to it, or who had no leisure to turn over the facts themselves in his mind, could possibly guess that a further and a very important step in the rapidly maturing process of degrading the House of Commons was recommended in these plausible words. Yet such is undoubtedly the case; and, considering the near advent of new Corrupt Practices Bills, and new measures of enfranchisement and redistribution, the thing becomes of the first magnitude. The ideal of the new reformers is a large constituency; and the addition of a million or so of voters to the electoral roll would, unless Parliament is to be increased in numbers to an altogether unmanageable degree, make such constituencies a necessity. At the same time the whole tone of public opinion is against the notion of a long postponement of the declaration of the poll, and such a postponement may be allowed to be extremely undesirable in the interests not merely of party, but of fair election. Accordingly, the so-called necessary expenses will have a constant tendency to increase. Now, if the old principle of throwing the whole, or the far greater part of this increase on the candidates, were observed, there would be no very great harm in this. It is not, of course, true that a rich man, or the nominee of a rich man, is *per se* a better member of Parliament than a poor one. It is simply that in the circumstances of the case he is likely to be so. For, as Mr. GOSCHEN has pointed out, to the great annoyance of his party, the tendency of the new reform is to make the lower classes the sole arbiters of elections, and it is at least a counterpoise to this tendency that their selection should be virtually more or less limited to members of the upper. Any one to whom this argument may seem crude, has only to consider existing Parliaments in other countries. Neither in France nor in America is any but the very smallest expense necessarily incurred as a rule by a candidate, and the result is that Congress is filled with jobbing politicians, and the French Chamber with ambitious nobodies equally destitute of experience and brains. There was never a time in the worst and most corrupt part of English Parliamentary history when the members of the House of Commons would not compare favourably with these freely and cheaply elected representatives of an advanced civilization. A great deal is made of the respectable character and decent abilities of the one or two poor men who, unpatronized by rich ones, are now in the House. But it must be remembered that they are exceptions, and, as such, on their mettle; and besides that they are influenced by the atmosphere, deteriorated as that atmosphere already is, of a House formed for the most part of members of very different antecedents.

This, however, is the least part of the matter. The proposal to discharge considerable election expenses at the cost of the community has two other drawbacks which almost obscure the drawback that it facilitates the election of adventurers. In the first place, the increased cost, whether thrown on the rates or, as some advanced Radicals would like to see it, on Imperial funds, will fall on those who are already partially disfranchised, and who, if the scheme of the present Government as foreshadowed by Sir HENRY JAMES and Lord HARTINGTON be passed, will be disfranchised wholly—the upper and middle classes. They will have, according to the old Hungarian parallel, to pay for their own damage and disqualification. This, however, in view of the greater evils which in that case would await them, may be thought to be a minor matter. But the manipulation of the enlarged sums thus disposable, further increased as they are likely to be by the prohibition of private expenditure on canvassing conveyances, printing, and all the chief items of election expenditure, will throw a new and powerful handle into the hands of the municipal authorities, who, on the Birmingham system, will be generally identified with the political wire-pullers, it may be of this party, it may be of that. It is noteworthy that even Mr. FORSTER, in anticipating electoral changes, seems dubious of the advantages of substituting for the present political independence of Londoners something quite different. But it is said that the Liverpool system, which has for some years been one of expenditure beyond the strictly legal amount, has been worked with perfect fairness. There is little reason to doubt it, for parties in Liverpool are nearly enough balanced to make tampering of any kind dangerous, and the complete CHAMBERLAIN-SCHNADHORST device of working the whole machine of borough Government and officialism on the American plan of the spoils

to the victors has never yet found a home on the Mersey. But its extension there and elsewhere is only a question of time, and there is unfortunately every reason to believe that it will not be employed by one political party only. At present, under the "parsimonious" scale of the existing Acts, the admitted legal expenditure at Liverpool was not much less than 2,000*l.*, representing, be it remembered, a single day's work. The extension of this expenditure actually ventured upon, carried it to close on the middle point between 2,000*l.* and 3,000*l.*, not a penny of which was spent on any one of several items which, according to the Radical school above referred to, should be chargeable not on the candidates, but on the public. The magnitude of the sum that would thus be disposable by a corporation or local authority of any kind, organised on the Birmingham model, may easily be conceived. Nor does even this consideration exhaust the mischief of the proposal. At present, as has been seen in this instance, it is the interest of candidates to watch the public expenditure narrowly. "Parsimony" being once done away with, that interest would cease, and the Corporation, through its paid officers, could spend exactly as much of the ratepayers' money as it could manage decorously to disguise under the legal heads—that money being obtained, for the most part, from a powerless minority of voters. From this liberty to direct corruption for the purpose of supplementing and lubricating the action of the Caucus is a very short step. To sum up the matter, it is impossible to conceive a proceeding more likely to destroy the old meaning of the words "a free Parliament" than the permission of unlimited outlay on elections at the expense of the public. It would only result in the creation of a new form of corruption, far more difficult to deal with and far more mischievous in its effects than the old.

RAILWAYS AND COMMONS.

THE coming Session promises to be memorable in the annals of the unending war between Railway Companies and that small portion of the public which is interested in things that do not immediately concern themselves. In the matter of earth hunger the railways are as greedy as an Irish tenant or a French peasant proprietor, and for one reason or another the land for which they seem to have a particular craving is the land from which they ought in the vast majority of cases to be absolutely excluded. The fragments of common land which they have left us in the immediate neighbourhood of London are now beyond their reach, though for the most part they succeeded in spoiling them before they were rescued from their hands. The charm of suburban London, which elsewhere has disappeared under the hand of the speculative builder, still lingers on the commons; but as they have usually been cut in half by a railway before they came into the hands of the local authorities, it is only the ghost of their former beauty that remains. It would be unsafe indeed to assume that what is left even is safe from further attack. Wimbledon and Barnes are examples to the contrary in quite recent years. For the moment, however, the attention of the Railway Companies seems diverted to other districts—districts in which the mischief remaining to be done is infinitely greater, while there is not the same certainty that the public will hear of it in time to prevent it, or take the trouble necessary for its prevention if they do hear of it. The *Times* of last Wednesday gave a useful summary of the bills by which sundry Railway Companies propose to take 420 acres of forest and common land. These schemes are not all perhaps equally objectionable, but there is scarcely one of them which is not objectionable; and yet, unless close and immediate attention is paid to them, some, or all of them, will certainly become law.

The only way in which this can be prevented is by a careful combination of action in London and action in the districts to which the schemes relate. The latter must, from the nature of the case, be the action of a small number of persons. Common and forest land is not thickly populated, nor is it for the benefit of the residents in its immediate neighbourhood that it is ordinarily most important to save it. What is chiefly wanted from them is accurate information—information as to the exact effect of what the Railway Companies propose to do. For example, among the Railway Bills for the coming Session is one to take 23 acres of moor-

land between Bolton and Caldbeck, and another to take 12 acres of a common in the heart of the Black Country. The first of these is described in the *Times* as a wild but comparatively dull district lying to the north of Skiddaw. There are few things on which individual opinions differ more than on the application of the term "dull" to a moorland landscape. Very often it happens that the scenery so described is the setting, and the only appropriate setting, to other and finer scenery, and that if the setting be destroyed the injury to this finer scenery will be beyond repair. This argument is not likely to apply to a common in the heart of the Black Country; but, as the *Times* justly says, in so thickly-populated a district every acre of open ground has a sanitary virtue. It is permissible, moreover, to hope that even the Black Country may not always deserve its name as literally as it does now, and if at some distant time its chimneys are made to consume their own smoke, and vegetation again becomes possible, open land will be of the utmost use for the purpose of planting. There are no trees now in the heart of the Black Country, but there may be trees there some day, so long as there is any land left on which they may hereafter grow. If the only ground available for this purpose is broken in two by embankments, or taken up for sidings and coal-sheds, no such future will remain for a district which man has treated with unparalleled cruelty. Unless, however, abstract arguments of this kind are reinforced by the testimony of those who know the ground they are not likely to make much impression on the public.

Some of the schemes relate either to better known country or to country lying closer to London, and here it may be easier to organize an effective opposition. Thus it is proposed to extend the Didcot, Newbury, and Southampton line to Ringwood and Bournemouth, cutting the New Forest right through the centre. "No less," says the *Times*, "than 110 acres of the Forest are actually consumed by this line; whilst its effects in severance and destruction of quietude and beauty cannot be estimated." The Great Eastern Company renew the proposal they made in 1881 to take a line from Chingford to High Beech, thus cutting off a part of Epping Forest from the rest and adorning the finest part of the whole range of woodlands by the congenial surroundings of a suburban railway station with its attendant taverns. The Brathwaite and Buttermere Railway is to be carried up Borrowdale to the top of Honistar Pass. In Surrey and Sussex the commons of West Wickham and Limpsfield and the forest of Ashdown are to be invaded by the new line to Eastbourne. There is not one of these projects that ought not to be resisted to the utmost. The New Forest and the Lake District belong to England; Epping Forest and the open land of Surrey and Sussex belong in an especial manner to London. England is neither so large nor so rich in untouched scenery of an exceptionally high order that she can afford to have the two districts which, in their several ways are most striking and most irreplaceable, wantonly destroyed. London has spread so far, and has so entirely lost possession of the beauty which it once enjoyed nearer home, that it is of the utmost moment to save every bit of wild land that lies within an easy day's journey. Every year it is less possible to find any such country within reach of a ride or drive—to find it within reach of a walk it has long been impossible; but there is no reason why it should ever become impossible to reach it by railway, and if the railways themselves are allowed to destroy the scenery which it is one of their most useful functions to bring to our doors the mischief will be done, and done for ever, before we are aware of it. The typical instance of this kind is the railroad from Chingford to High Beech. The argument in this case is, that as the Epping Forest has been dedicated to the people, it should be made as accessible as possible. The answer to this reasoning is conclusive. Make it as accessible as you like, provided that you do not destroy what you are trying to bring nearer. Take people as close to the Forest as you can, but do not on the plea of taking them into the Forest make the Forest itself worthless. The presence of a railway, and most of all of a suburban railway, is destructive of natural beauty. Those who most enjoy the woods of High Beech when they are among them will be most injured by the way in which the Great Eastern Company propose to take them there. If the pictures in the National Gallery were exposed in Trafalgar Square, they might be

seen by more people in a day than they are now; the objection to the greater publicity is that the pictures would be destroyed in the process. The plea that more people would go to see High Beech if they could get there by railway is open to the same criticism. More people would go to see it, but there would soon be nothing for them to see. More than this, the great majority of the visitors to Epping Forest are just as well pleased with the part already accessible to them as they would be with High Beech; while the minority who really value High Beech will have nothing to make up to them for its virtual destruction. If it were a question of gratifying ten thousand people or one thousand, the ten thousand ought doubtless to be first thought of. In this case, however, it is proposed to deprive the one thousand of their pleasure merely to give the ten thousand a repetition of a pleasure which they enjoy already.

This, of course, is a case in which the conditions are of a very special kind. More generally the Railway Companies do not condescend to argument. They simply say that they have secured the consent of the persons interested in the land they propose to take, or of some of them, and that the public has no right to interfere. Then why do they come to the public for their consent? So long as the leave of the community must be asked to make a railway the community has a veto on the mode in which it is proposed to make it. If it is simply a matter to be settled between the Company, the lord of the manor, and the commoners, why must a Bill be carried through Parliament before the land can be appropriated? The possessor of a veto has a most effective interest in the subject to which the veto relates. In this case Parliament holds the veto in trust for the community, or for such parts of the community as are interested in the preservation of the land in its present form. If the railways plead that it is for the public interest that the line shall be made, that of course is an argument to which all due weight must be given. But it can hardly ever be necessary to take the line across common land instead of across cultivated land adjoining the common land. The motive for preferring the common land is almost always that it costs the Company less than the cultivated land, and though this may be of great importance to the promoters, it is of next to no importance to the community. It remains for the Common Preservation Society to put their best foot foremost during the approaching Session. There never was more need for them to be active; and the more active they are the more public support they are likely to obtain.

THE FIRE IN WINDSOR STREET.

IT was perhaps because the fire in Windsor Street came after so many others that it excited comparatively little attention; but it was too probably also for another, and less creditable, reason. Other fires had destroyed vast quantities of property; this only killed six poor people, and burnt their overcrowded house. Yet it has been in many respects more worthy of attention than disasters on a larger scale. The fire in Wood Street or in the Alhambra only proved that, when theatres or warehouses full of dry goods are once allowed to get into flames, it is impossible to put them out. But the inquest held on the six persons burnt in Windsor Street proved a great deal more than that. Its interest is not in the novelty of what it has shown, for that is, unfortunately, a very old story. It deserves careful attention because it shows once more, and in the most melancholy manner, how little the best-intentioned Acts of Parliament and the exertions of different authorities have done to remedy a state of things which is a danger and a disgrace to London. After some recent scandals it is satisfactory to find a coroner who has resisted the temptation to allow his jury to indulge in a sensational inquiry. Mr. W. J. PAYNE very properly declared that he would not allow his court "to be used for the purpose of ferreting out evidence for civil proceedings." But he did not consider himself bound to limit the inquiry to the immediate causes of the fire. The conditions which made such a thing probable at any moment were equally among the causes; and as it is only too probable that, unless the coroner's jury brought them to light, they would never be known at all, they cannot be said to have been improperly included in the evidence.

This house in Windsor Street was one among thousands which are in a state that has been declared intolerable

for years. It contained nine rooms, two of them being built out behind of wood. It was inhabited by thirty-two persons. The mere statement that so many people lived in a house of this size is enough by itself to make it unnecessary to look for other evidence of what their conditions of life must have been; but there was abundance of further detail given at the inquest. We hear of a family of three grown-up persons living in one of the little wooden rooms built out at the back. One of the rooms in the body of the house was inhabited by a family of nine, and all the others were more or less crowded. Besides the people belonging to the house, it was regularly used by vagrants, who slept on the staircase at night. In such a state of things, order or decency was almost impossible. People who have to submit as a necessary condition of life to crowding of this kind are not likely to be particular in smaller things. One witness allowed that the lath and plaster of the house was broken down, but he took that kind of thing for granted—poor people could not expect to live in mansions. It came out that there was no glass in some of the windows, but, according to the landlord's agent, and he was probably right, the lodgers preferred that, as it afforded ventilation to the house. Of course it equally afforded ventilation to the fire when it happened, and helped it quite as much as the dryness of the old wood or the numerous coatings of paint. And, considering the way in which the work of the house was carried on, it is remarkable that the fire did not happen sooner. Of course every family did such cooking as was possible in its own room; but in addition to that some of the lodgers carried on their work in the cellar, by the light of lamps which they hung from the beams. Considering all this, it is not wonderful that smoke was found penetrating into some of the rooms for days before the fire, or that the lodgers had complained of a smell of burning. In a house largely built of wood, and nearly two centuries old, as this was, the fire had probably been smouldering somewhere for long. If dwellings of this kind were very rare, or were rapidly disappearing, it might not be necessary to take much notice of what has happened to this house. But that is not the case. Such dwellings are still too common; and, when they disappear, are seldom replaced by better, or, indeed, by any kind of inhabited house. What they are removed for are warehouses or offices; and of course those which remain become continually worse. The workpeople must live somewhere; and, as the witness JOHN FROGLEY said, must put up with what they can get. For this house was not, in the strict sense of the word, a rookery, a place inhabited by thieves and prostitutes. The lodgers seem to have been honest and hard-working people, only very poor. And there must be many thousands of others who have to live in the same fashion. For them it is a necessity as long as such places are all they can get; but it is by no means a necessity that this should be the case; and it will be well if what this inquest has brought to light does something to rouse public opinion into insisting that the authorities who possess the needful powers to apply the remedy should use them with proper vigour. Parliament has long ago given municipalities powers to provide proper dwellings for the artisans; and, although something has been done, it has been far short of what was needed. The great blocks of workmen's houses which have been built in London have been filled as fast as they were finished, and are very good of their kind; but there are not nearly enough of them. On grounds of charity and humanity alone, it would be the duty of the various authorities responsible for the government of London to do all they can to remedy this state of things; but it is the interest of the community at large also. The miserable streets of overcrowded houses are a standing danger to the metropolis. They are the cause of disease and immorality, and it is not only possible, but probable, that a fire of a far more destructive kind than any we have seen for long may begin in one of them. The firemen who gave their evidence at the inquest all agreed that they had never seen a fire do its work so quickly as this. If it had happened while the overworked brigade had a great fire elsewhere to struggle against, it might well have spread over a whole district. It is high time that the task of rebuilding the workmen's quarters of London should be set about on a scale befitting its importance, and that owners of rookeries should be made to understand that no tenderness is due to a vested interest in fever and uncleanness.

Meanwhile, since such places as Windsor Street cannot

be removed at once, and ought not to be removed till new quarters are provided for the inhabitants, it is obviously right that they should be well looked after while they last. There is a sanitary organization of an elaborate kind to do the work, and this inquest gives us some opportunity of seeing how it is done. The evidence cannot be said to have been one-sided. Three different witnesses, the agent of the landlord, a sanitary Inspector in the service of the Commission of Sewers, and the curate of the parish, all had a chance to speak on the subject; and though they differed in opinion as to the meaning of the facts, they were almost unanimous as to the facts themselves. Mr. SALTMARSH, the Inspector, thought that the house was in a satisfactory state for a place of that kind. He agreed that there were thirty-two people in it, and that it was in a bad state in some ways; but it had never been condemned, and he took no notice of what was said in wardmotes unless it came to him officially. That is the language which is perfectly familiar to everybody who has had occasion to look into an abuse; it is the official style of gentlemen who desire to do as little as possible, or who have not the power to do anything. The landlord's agent declared that all complaints had been attended to; but the evidence of JOHN FROGLEY shows what the complaints would be, and with how little the tenants would be satisfied. Whether the community ought to be so easily satisfied is another question. There is no ground on which to accuse the owner of this house of exceptional neglect. As long as public opinion allows owners of property of this kind to draw rent from them unblamed or nearly so, no single owner can be fairly accused of neglect or abuse for doing what all do. Not the less there will be a very general agreement with Mr. HADDEN, the curate, that such places are unfit for human habitation. His statement that when the condition of these houses was brought before the Commissioners of Sewers some time ago all that came of the complaint was a great deal of talk, and that the street remained just what it was before, has a convincing air of probability. It is only too plain that the most necessary duty of providing proper houses for the poor has been played with. It cannot be said that it has been neglected altogether, because there are large blocks of buildings in conspicuous places to show that something has been done. But it has been done by fits and starts; the destruction has come before the new houses were ready, and when they are the rents are too high for the very poor. A part of the more prosperous class of workmen are perhaps, as a rule, better off than ever; but for the poor the improvements have done nothing but drive them closer and closer into the miserable old houses which remain.

IN AND ABOUT CANNES.

OF all the winter stations on the Mediterranean, Cannes is by far the most popular with the English, whether they leave their own country in pursuit of pleasure or pursuit of health. The reasons for this preference are manifold. First and foremost among them stands the fact that "everybody" goes there, and it is at once taken for granted that it must therefore necessarily be superior to the haunts frequented by nobodies. Setting the question of climate aside, many invalids still cling to Cannes because they are loth to feel themselves shunted any sooner than must be out of the world which they have a painful feeling they may leave for ever at an early day. Now at Cannes all their English acquaintances may be counted on for turning up some time or other in the winter or spring with almost the same certainty as one reckons on their reappearance in London a few months later. And to the invalid who is past frequenting "at homes" or paying visits, a little mundane gossip as to the matches that have been made or marred in some well-known county, or accurate statistics as to who bagged how much at the last big shoot, comes as a wonderful tonic and reviver. Then again, Cannes is the nearest of all the pleasant halting-places along that line of coast, and where the journey is of necessity so long and so fatiguing, every hour added on to it has the weight of the last straw, and any longings that may be felt towards San Remo or Bordighera vanish before the formidable prospect of the fuss and discomfort and delay inseparable from the crossing of the frontier. Sick folk too have a horror of putting themselves beyond the pale of English doctors or out of the beat of English clergymen, and at Cannes they have a happy sense of security in the near neighbourhood of both. And for the able-bodied pleasure-seekers, or for the jaded and weary workers who are in search of restoration of their shattered forces, Cannes has numberless attractions to offer. Thanks to its situation, the variety of its pleasant walks and drives is great, for the mountains that further east come close to the sea, from Nice turn more inland, so that there is a stretch of undulating country between them and the shore. The coast-line sweeps round

in a wide gulf facing full south, bounded to westward by the chain of the Esterel Mountains, and to the east by the south-stretching promontory of the Cap d'Antibes. This gulf is again divided into two bays by a sandy spit of land called La Croisette; and on the western of these two bays lies Cannes, with the Ile Ste Marguerite, that crosses La Croisette, like the top of a T, stretching half across the bay and acting in some sort as a natural breakwater. The old town is built on a hilly promontory on the western side of the bay. The houses crowd on the top of one another up its steep and rocky sides; their roofs, rising tier above tier like the steps of some giant's staircase, are surmounted by the battlements of the old church, which was fortified, that it might serve as a refuge to the townsfolk in times of war. And on the very summit of Mont Chevalier, as this height is called, towers the imposing ruin of a great square feudal keep, the massive blocks of its basement dating probably from the days of Roman occupation. In the narrow streets, or rather staircases, which mount this height, picturesqueness and dirt are found in their usual combination. At the base of the old town lies the harbour, the sails of the vessels with which it is thronged contrasting prettily with the brown roofs of the houses that rise immediately behind them. The bay is skirted with a line of villas and hotels, stretching half-way down La Croisette, the extreme point of which is occupied by a "tir aux pigeons" and the ruins of a fort set up by Richelieu to batter the Spaniards out of the opposite island. Between the old town and the villas the market-place acts as a connecting link. Early every morning the hotelkeepers and other purveyors for the table of the visitors chaffer briskly with the countryfolk who have brought in their produce from the country round. It is a noisy and busy scene, and the brilliant tints of pumpkins, tomatoes, and oranges of the greengrocers' stalls blending brightly with the gay garments of their vendors are at once the delight and despair of the sketcher who strives to reproduce it. Of fish there is but little to be seen. Of "oursins," however, the supply seems never to fail, and the sellers drive a brisk trade. For this shell-fish, which to look at is much like a small hedgehog that has rolled itself into a ball, is a delicacy much esteemed by the natives, who may be seen at all hours of the day cracking its spine-protected shell and sucking the bones.

To the west of the old town lie the villas of Lord Brougham and some of the original colonists, and the road no longer skirts the sea, but is separated from it by houses and gardens. Most places spread westward, but Cannes is an exception to this rule. It is stretching out to the east, and bids fair before long to unite itself to Antibes. On account, perhaps, of the roar of the sea or the roar of the railway which skirts it, or both perhaps combined, everyone now tries to get ground inland. So the town is spreading towards Le Cannet, a village consisting of a few blocks of many-storied houses crowded close together, that look as if they had been transplanted there from the middle of some large town. Peeling lemons seems to be the chief industry of the inhabitants. The women sit in their doorways with piles of the green fruit, the rind of which they strip off entire with wonderful dexterity. The long curls of peel are then hung out of the windows to dry, and the narrow streets are pervaded with the delicious scent. To this village Cannes will ere long spread. A wide boulevard has been made to connect the two, and every metre of land is largely competed for and run up to a fancy price. But, however large it may grow, it does not seem possible that Cannes should ever be a handsome town, as no regular plan has been followed in the building of the houses or laying out of the roads. The houses give one the idea of having been dropped down at random. Here one sees a pretty "cottage orne" hidden in the seclusion of its own "grounds," while next to it stands a huge, staring, box-shaped villa stuck close to the road, and destitute alike of lawn and garden, while a large hotel rears its unsightly front a few paces further on. The roads, too, are narrow and bad, and there is so little facility for cross-communication between them, that one frequently has to drive for a mile or two in going between places that are hardly over a hundred yards apart. The long distances make a carriage indispensable to the enjoyment of Cannes. Things have changed since the days when Prosper Mérimée dwelt on the delights of rambling through the pines that clothed the sides of the surrounding hills. The churlishness of some recent purchasers of the woods has closed up the pleasant pathways that used to intersect them. Luckily for foot-passengers, the pathway that runs along the aqueduct which supplies Cannes with water from the far-distant sources of the Siagne is town property, and can therefore be neither closed nor trenced upon by the palings of jealous proprietors; and as it runs half-way up the hillside, into one who follows its windings enjoys a wide-ranging view of sea, sky, and mountain.

One other pleasant walk, too, is still left from which the wayfarer has not yet been driven by the throng of carriages; for the ascent is so steep as to forbid the passage to any beast of burden, save a mule or a mountain pony. This is the way over the Col to Vallauris. At the top of the Col stand a chapel and a little wayside shrine, facing each other on either side of the road. Both are dedicated to St. Antoine. Dirty and neglected as they look all the year round, on the fête day of the saint they are decorated with green boughs and flowers, and mass is celebrated on the altar in the chapel. And when the shrine was overturned by a runaway mule that came tilting against it with a heavily-laden cart of stones no time was lost in setting it up again. As St. Antoine is credited with having the charge of all lost property, and the power of re-

storing it to its owners, no doubt he is a saint thought worth propitiating by a peasantry wonderfully tenacious of everything that belongs to them except their time. One wonders if the idlers to be seen sitting on the chapel steps trust that the saint will restore to them their lost time as well as their lost property. By turning aside to the left of the chapel and climbing to the ridge of the hill, one commands the most extensive view that the neighbourhood of Cannes can offer. To the east, point beyond point, the eye follows the coast-line as far as Bordighera, and to the west as far as Toulon. On one side we look down on Cannes, the Esterels and the Islands; on the other, we look away over Antibes to Nice gleaming white at the base of its mountain background, while to the north the eye weary of the ever-restless sea turns with a feeling of satisfaction to the silent snow-clad summits of the Alps, that seem to breathe the very spirit of repose. At our feet in a hollow warded from every breath of mistral by the surrounding hills lies the large village of Vallauris. The fertility of the district won for it the name of the Golden Valley from the Roman occupiers, a corruption of which has given the modern designation. It has long been famed for its pottery. But the potters now have had their attention turned from the manufacture of useful "marmites" to that of fancy pots of all shades and shapes for which the visitors to Cannes show an insatiable craving. An expedition to Vallauris is one of the regulation drives from Cannes, and so fond are the drivers of the "voitures de place" of bringing unwary fares this way and of urging them to visit the potteries that there is room for suspicion that they are not uninterested in the profits of the possible purchases. The "marmites" are conveyed down to the coast of the Golfe Jouan, and there shipped on board sailing-vessels or packed in trucks for transportation by rail. Judging by the quantities thus exported, one would say that the breakage of pottery in French households of the humbler sort must be serious and unremitting. The Golfe affords excellent anchorage, and once at least every season half-a-dozen of the biggest ironclads of the French fleet come steaming in from Toulon or Villefranche, and take up their station here. Indeed the visit of the fleet is one of the stock excitements of Cannes, and crowds of curious visitors come down to the Golfe to inspect the vessels. Every encouragement is given to these visitors, who are shown all over the many decks of these huge floating castles, and have the machinery explained to them with the utmost good-nature and patience. But to an English eye there is a want of the trimness and smartness that distinguishes our own navy, and there is a painful expression of duty done by compulsion about the men that makes it impossible to forget that the navy as well as the army is supplied by conscription.

The Golfe is a spot of some importance in the history of the world; for it was here that Napoleon landed from Elba, in 1815, and thereby rekindled the flames of European war. Oddly enough, just when Bonaparte was making this desperate effort to regain the crown he had usurped, the Prince of Monaco was returning peaceably to take possession of his hereditary dominions. After passing through Cannes, his carriage was stopped, and he was invited to have an interview with the dethroned Emperor, whom he found bivouacking under the pine-trees. This over it was intimated to the Prince that he must return to Cannes, and not attempt to continue his journey till the next day. By that time Napoleon was far enough off on the way to Paris to be out of reach of pursuit. He rode over the mountains to Grenoble, taking Grasse on his way. The Grassois were utterly astonished at his unlooked-for appearance, and the Maire utterly refused to receive him in the town, or to supply the assistance he asked for in prosecuting what seemed such a foolhardy enterprise. A grassy sward on the top of the high limestone cliffs that rise above the town, bearing the name of the Plateau Napoléon, is pointed out as the spot where he halted after being denied admittance to Grasse, and admired the panorama of the fertile olive-covered country that lay between him and the sea over which he had just made his perilous voyage. Between the Croisette and the Golfe Jouan is certainly the most agreeable part of Cannes. Here we find the handsomest villas and the best gardens, most of them inhabited by their owners, many of whom are French. It has the advantage of being well away from the town and the hotels. The soil too is much warmer than the clay of the central district, so that the acacias of diverse sorts and other beautiful flowering trees flourish in astonishing luxuriance. For those who are not lucky enough to inhabit this favourite quarter, which bears the suggestive names of Californie and Eden, the road that passes through it is a very popular drive. It skirts the shore of the Golfe Jouan, and is bordered by some of the finest olive-trees to be seen in the district. It then crosses the neck of the Cap and comes down on the town of Antibes, the Roman Antipolis, so called because it stood exactly opposite Nicæa. Antibes is like a fossil town dug out of the middle ages, for it is still surrounded by Vauban's fortifications in a perfect state. It stands on a hill rising from the sea. The two towers that seem inseparable from all the towns along this coast rise conspicuously above the roofs of the surrounding houses. It is a garrison town, and on the slopes outside the walls the drilling of new recruits may frequently be witnessed. Antibes is so taken up with soldiering that it has no time to think of attracting foreigners; so that, although it is beautifully situated, there is no accommodation for the reception of strangers. The fort, a construction of Vauban, crowns the hill on the opposite side of the harbour. Though of no use now in a military sense, it is a most picturesque object in

the landscape, as it groups well with the tall towers of the town, and stands out in strong relief against the violet tints of the mountain background. Antibes is ten kilomètres distant from Cannes, and is therefore about the limit of an afternoon drive in this land, where it is expedient to get under cover before sunset.

OLD IRISH IDEAS.

AN elderly Irishman was lately found in great distress in Bristol. He informed people who asked concerning his grief, that he was a member of an Irish Brotherhood. According to the fraternal laws of this Society he was bound either to be shot or stabbed, and he piteously protested that he preferred being shot. Probably this child of Erin was more or less tipsy. But what a curious idea of brotherhood is the Irish idea! "*Sois mon frère et je te tuerai*," seems to be the new formula, in place of the old "*Sois mon frère ou je te tue*." It would be unjust to select this beery old bemused patriot as a representative of "Irish ideas." But we are often told that Ireland must be governed "in accordance with Irish ideas," and the question "In accordance with which Irish ideas?" naturally arises. For example, there is the Irish idea that it is easy to buy perjured Catholic evidence against the life of an innocent man, but that it is impossible for a guilty Catholic to protest his innocence on the scaffold. If this Irish idea be employed in administering Ireland, all condemned Catholics will escape by declaring their innocence, while the condemned Protestants will be hanged as a matter of course, let them protest as they may. And, with Irish jury laws in accordance with Irish ideas, it is not likely that many Protestants who are put on their trial will escape. Certain emergency men, or bailiffs, were lately attacked by Nationalists, fired back, and killed one of their assailants. An Irish coroner's jury naturally brought in a verdict of wilful murder. Things are just as they were in Edmund Spenser's century:—"Now most all the freeholders of that realme are Irish, which, when the cause shall fall betwixt an Englishman and an Irish, or between the Queene and any free holder of that countrey, they make noe more scruple to pass agaynst an Englishman and the Queene, though it be to strayne their oathes, than to drink milke unstrayned. See that before the jury goe together, it is well known what the verdict will be." Spenser concludes that "either the course of the law for tryall must be altered or other provision for juries made." The converse accusation is made by Irish patriots against all juries that now convict murderers. But if we govern Ireland according to Irish ideas, not only will all "cream-faced loyalists" be condemned by juries, but all Catholics who are so unlucky as to be condemned will be set free on their own "last dying declaration" that they are innocent.

The author of the *Faery Queen* is still remembered, it is said, as an intruder, a land-grabber—a grabber, indeed, of things in general—by the Irish peasantry. They turned the tables on him at last by burning his house and, according to some accounts, one of his children. Spenser's evidence about Ireland three hundred years ago is that of an intelligent planter who has been living among people like the Maoris in New Zealand. He regards the Irish almost as savages, and he particularly detests the English who, as he says, "curry favour" with them. But he is not unaware that some Irish institutions were once extant and powerful among the ancestors of his own people, and he even attributes some of the stranger "Irish ideas" to an English origin. His testimony about the English who were more Irish than the Irish is interesting just now when many of the most "Nationalist" politicians are obviously English by blood. Mr. Carey, whose name figures prominently among the persons accused by the informer Farrell, must probably be of Devonshire or Welsh extraction, and not an Irish Celt; Mr. Parnell's blood must, of course, be English; and Mr. Biggar's name bewrays him for a Scotchman by lineage. "The English-Irish," says Spenser, "are worse than the wilde Irish: Lord! howe quickly doth that countrey alter men's natures." Again, "the chiefest abuses which are nowe in that realme are growen from the Englishes that were, but are nowe much more lawlesse and licentious than the very wilde Irish," just as a bad "Pakeha Maori" is a more desperate customer than a Maori by birth. "Through licentious conversing with the Irish, or fostering them, or lacke of good nurture," many ancient English houses "are grown as Irish as"—never mind what! But Spenser admits that "some greate warriors say that they never sawe a more comely horse man than the Irish man, nor that cometh on more bravely in his charge."

The Irish ideas chiefly offensive to Spenser are headed by "the Brehone law," wherein "there appeareth greateshew of equitey, in determining the right between party and partye, but in many things repugning quite both to God and mans law." The thing that most "repugns" is the compounding for murder by payment. This custom is Homeric, was Norse, is found in New Zealand, and left its traces in the Athenian criminal law. The Brehon secured his fee by assigning often a larger fine to himself than to the kindred of the slain man. We do not ask whether Ireland would be conciliated if we reintroduced this Irish custom. Ireland will never be conciliated while there is anything to be gained by

agitators. But, if English rule were altogether withdrawn, would this pleasing "Brehon" law be re-established *conside Parnell*? As to the Irish idea of Tanistry, we scarcely like to raise the question. For even the most patriotic Irish do not appear to be absolutely unanimous about questions of land tenure, and Mr. Davitt would probably oppose the whole system (Irish though it be) of which Tanistry was a part. The "Tanistih" was the next successor to the "Captainry," and was elected at the same time as the chief. The Tanistih "hath a share of the countrey allotted to him, and certayne cuttings and spendings upon all the Inhabitauntes under the Lord." How would the "Inhabitauntes" like that old Irish idea? They would probably correct one Irish institution by another, and shoot (from behind a wall) both Tanistih and Lord. Then the Brehon would hear the case, and settle his own fee. And then the "Inhabitauntes" would shoot the Brehon; and then the Brehon's family would take up his blood-feud—and it would all be very lively and very Irish. But whether the adoption of these Irish ideas would tend to the prosperity and happiness of the isle is altogether another question. Spenser, however, adds, very sensibly, "Lawes ought to be fashioned unto the manners and conditions of the people, and not to be imposed unto them, according to the simple rule of right, for els they pervert Justice to extreme Injustice." So perhaps Brehon law is no longer fashioned unto the condition of the modern Irish. But what law is? The Land-laws! "It is a very unseasonable time to pleade lawe, when a sword is drawn in the hande of the vulgar. . . . Then so it is with Ireland continually, for the sword was never yet out of theyr hand; but when they are weary of warres, and brought down to extreme wretchedness, then they creep a little, perhaps, and sue for grace, till they have gotten new breath and recovered their strength agayne. So it is in vayne to speake of planting of lawes, and plotting of pollicies, till they are altogether subdued"—that is, till the Greek Calends. This last sentiment of Spenser's is probably not remote from the opinion of Lord Hartington.

Spenser mentions a number of Irish ideas which he does not take the trouble to explain. These are "Cuddeehih, Cossihirh, Bonaught, Shragh, Shorehim, and such like." Patriots like the learned Mr. Biggar would doubtless revel in ideas, or at least names, so Irish as Shragh and Bonaught, and would give up their whole souls to the delicious pastime of Cuddeehih, while Shorehim could not but bring balm to patriotic souls. But there is one slight drawback. These customs, though Irish apparently in name, were originally, Spenser thinks, brought in by the English. For Shragh (exquisite as it sounds) must be some kind of Rent, and so is Bonaught, we fear. Now as to Rent, Spenser says the Irish "are very loth to yield any certayne rent." They are still uncommonly "loth" to do this; it is an Irish idea of the most antique and persistent. The tenants used only to furnish certain "spendings," saying commonly, "Spend me, and defend me." It is now the landlord who has most cause to say "defend me," while the tenants "spend him," or at least his rent, in lordly style. So much have times altered, and so hopeless is it for a representative of "landlordism" to obtain his *shragh* and his *shorehim*.

Irish ideas in dress were peculiar. Men and women wore a huge "mantell" in which every outlaw had all the house and home he needed. This was convenient for the nomadic and pastoral Irish who dwelt in "Bolyes"—"pasturing upon the mountayn, and waste wild places, and removing still to fresh land as they have depastured the former," like Scythians or Tartars. Now why does not Mr. Davitt demand the re-establishment of so pleasing an idea as the Bolye? "It is very behoofull in that countrey of Ireland, where there are greateshew mountaynes, and waste desartes full of grasse." So says one of the speakers in Spenser's dialogue. Probably the members of each Bolye were better nourished than the starving farmers of a few acres of bog, and the life, if rude, was healthy. Spenser objects that criminals were readily concealed in the Bolyes; but, in Ireland, they find plenty of hiding without Bolyes, and have only to dread the treachery of their partners in crime. The Bolye was a kind of acknowledgment that pasture, not agriculture, is the best way of using vast districts of Ireland. The members of the Bolyes were "more barbarous" than they that lived in towns, but it must have been a healthy and picturesque kind of barbarism. Spenser is very hard on the "glibb," the national way of dressing thick locks of hair to fall over the face. "They are as fitt maskes as a mantell is for a thief." A criminal "either cutteth of his glibbe quite, by which he becometh nothing like himself, or pulleth it soe low downe over his eyes, that it is very hard to discern his thievish countenance." Spenser was for putting down the slogans, or clan cries, and the waxes and wallings for the dead, still common in Corsica. The women, too, should learn not to ride "on the wrong side of theyr horse." Altogether the Irish of Spenser's time, with their Brehon laws, their noisy folk-motes, their round painted targets, their huge mantles, their faces hidden by heavy hair, their nomad Bolyes, their *Beantoolhe*, or wandering lewd women, their roving professional gamesters (*Kearrooghs*), their bards, their equipment of short bows and barbed arrows, and all the rest of their manners, make a curious ethnological study. But can the most patriotic Irishman deny that a certain advance in civilization has been marked by a certain departure from old Irish ideas? "I have seene the Irish drinke, not theyr enemies, but theyr friendes blood," says Spenser, and he gives an example which readers may be left to seek in his *View of the Present State of Ireland*. He sums up the character of the Irish as "cruel,

bloody, full of revenge and delighting in deadly executions, licentious, common ravishers of women, murderers of children," but withal "very valiant and hardy . . . very present in perils, very great scorers of death."

THE FUTURE OF CAIRO.

IT is not easy to get up a controversy where every one is agreed. For some weeks past a series of letters to the daily papers has been engaged in stirring, or trying to stir, public opinion, and create a little interest in the future state of Cairo. But Cairo is very far off, and the correspondence languishes. It wants personality. There is no one to abuse or be abused. The firing is all in the air. Every one knows that Cairo is very picturesque and very untidy. It is equally well known that the late Khedive was anxious to make it look like a European town. Nor can anybody be ignorant that old buildings tumble down, are often robbed of their beauty by careless repairs, and are sometimes inconvenient for modern purposes. People who own pretty old houses in Cairo do not always care to inhabit them. You will often see a new stucco palace with an ancient Moresque house adjoining it, and learn that both belong to the same native gentleman, who lives in the new house and lets the old one go to ruin, or, worse still, lets it in tenements, when his tenants pick out the coloured marble inlays, and break down the carved ceilings and sell them surreptitiously. One street used to be full of the beautiful latticework of which such splendid examples have recently been conveyed to South Kensington. The street was a fashionable suburb about the middle of the fifteenth century. Now it is poor enough, and the lattices are fast disappearing. Moderns prefer Venetians, and some of the old houses are falling to pieces. A few have been deliberately pulled down and sold. On the whole, we cannot agree with some of the letter-writers who would prohibit the sale and export of old Arab woodwork. The little that is in our museums will probably survive all that is in Cairo. It is impossible to force fashion. The Cairene of the present likes Italian and French houses, and will not inhabit the palaces of his ancestors, and no one can force him to choose what he does not like. One thing, perhaps, can be done. The Government may be persuaded to desist from Haussmannizing Cairo. Great as has been the destruction caused by private owners, it is as nothing compared to the wholesale ruin caused by the formation of such streets as the Boulevard Mohammed Ali, which was ruthlessly run through the heart of the old town, and after many years is still but half lined with new houses, and is avoided by pedestrians and riders, for its unsuitable and shadeless width, and the wretched appearance of the ruins on either hand. Wide, hot, dusty streets are an abomination to the Cairene. They are windy in winter and blazing in summer. Any one who has been in Egypt, say in April, and has recklessly started to pay a visit among the wide desolate roads of the Ismailia quarter, will remember with gratitude the coolness of the narrow winding lanes of the old town.

The difficulty is of course to suggest a remedy. The Secretary of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings announces that the Committee have taken the matter up. We can only hope that they may have greater success in Cairo than they appear to have met with in England. The city of Cairo is not so much menaced by restoration as destruction, and the question, as the Society asserts, is thus simplified. It suggests that the Government of the Khedive should be invited to enforce the abandonment of all schemes for the removal of native buildings except in cases of danger to the inhabitants. This should be decided by competent judges. The Secretary goes on to make a second suggestion which will surprise some people. He thinks native architects should be employed, under the supervision of Europeans, to rebuild streets that have been pulled down. It is evident the writer has very little, if any, personal knowledge of Cairo. Does a native architect exist? The hideous new buildings about the Esbekieh have been built by a European architect, and so badly that they are already tumbling about his ears. The English church is in the style which used to be called "carpenter's Gothic," and a very poor example of that style. The Arab architect is, we fear, not in being, and there are some who say that he never did exist, and that the glories of old Cairo were built by Greek captives or others who came from the West. Nor is it an improbable theory. Even the characteristic Arab dome is known to have been borrowed. At the present day, the restoration, so called, of mosques is carried on by Greeks, and very badly too. A more hideous building than the mosque of Hassaneyn it is hard to conceive. A very similar, but even more ugly, building was begun many years ago in honour of a great Moslem saint, the Sheykh Rufayeh; it was placed, as if in rivalry, on the opposite side of the street in which the beautiful but dilapidated mosque of Sultan Hassan stands, and already, though unfinished, rises to a greater height. The mother of the late Khedive is understood to have paid for it so far. During the interregnum between the deposition of Ismail and the accession of Tewfik the Princess took advantage of the absence of authority to send her men and camels to fetch stones from the Pyramids for the building. The Correspondent of an English paper published at Alexandria wrote calling attention to the fact; and among the first acts of the present Khedive's reign were two orders, one giving the newspaper a warning, and the

other stopping the dilapidation. But such things go on at intervals; and the Mosque of Rufayeh grows slowly, and shows more and more plainly each successive year that native architects do not exist. Mr. Frank Dillon is content to advocate the preservation of what is still standing; and this, if it can be done, is almost as much as we can hope for now. He proposes the issue of a Commission to report on the present state of the case; but it is understood that such a Commission, formed of officials of the Egyptian Government, is actually in being already, and that it contains at least one well-known archaeologist, Mr. Rogers, whose work in elucidating the history of ancient Cairo has been mentioned in our columns more than once. Miss Amelia B. Edwards, another of the letter-writers to whom we have referred, expresses herself convinced that if the ancient architecture of Cairo should perish tourists will find equally sunny skies and equally balmy winds elsewhere. But the destructions contemplated even by Ismail did not amount to anything like wholesale ruin of all old buildings. Miss Edwards would also endeavour to foster native art. She would have schools opened to teach the Arab boy to design; but we fear her labour would be lost. There is perhaps no race on the face of the earth so utterly devoid of artistic perceptions as the modern Egyptian. His beautiful costume is prescribed by custom, and the rules for ensuring harmony of colour have been handed down from past generations.

But the more serious question remains, How are we to go to work? It is true that the French have an Archaeological Commission in Egypt, and it is one of the Commissioners, M. Arthur Rhoné, who has been the first to call public attention to the subject. If our Government sent such a Commission, it could not be regarded in the light of an aggression either by the French or the natives. It need not be called on to report so much as to survey, to see what buildings are in danger, what may be supported and strengthened, and to watch the repairs actually being carried out. At present the repair of an old building means its absolute destruction. We need not puzzle our readers with hard names, but about half a dozen of the finest mosques have been taken in hand for "restoration" during the past eight or ten years; and in each case the result has been the rebuilding of the whole structure, the removal of ancient carving, inlay, and colour, and the substitution of shallow mouldings and crude paint, with the adoption of a kind of half-pointed style extremely displeasing to the Western eye. The Greek architect employed has known no better. His workmen are, as we have observed, absolutely without artistic perceptions, and would destroy the most beautiful work of art in Cairo rather than take the slightest trouble to preserve it. Mr. Rhoné has written a really touching appeal for the preservation of the remains of ancient art; and it is impossible not to sympathize with him. Fifteen years ago Cairo was intact. Now "the ancient city of the Khalifs and the Sultans is traversed and pierced by right lines in formal figures." He compares the new and the old to the "irruption of an American city into the bosom of a virgin forest." The object of piercing the old streets is not very apparent. The wide new streets are extremely unpleasant to walk through. The old ones are very pleasant in all weathers. Cairo is a very healthy town. The water supply is excellent; and this, after all, is the most important thing in any large town. Fever is exceedingly rare, and is almost always, when it is encountered, found to have come from some other place, such as Naples. The old streets are certainly labyrinthine. One tourist a few years ago used to go into the native quarters and wander on till he lost himself, which he very speedily did, and then called a donkey boy and named his hotel. By doing this constantly he contrived to see parts of Cairo which few Europeans had ever visited before, and many also which have now disappeared. We must hope M. Rhoné's appeal to the virtual masters of Egypt will not be wholly disregarded. An artistic question is not one in which an English Government usually takes much interest; but, if ever an exception should be made, it should be in favour of Cairo. The Khedive must be convinced by some means or other that his beautiful capital would lose its charm to the tourist instead of gaining anything by being made to look like a third-rate colonial town, or, as Miss Edwards says, a fifth-rate Brussels. But Brussels has preserved her old buildings, and cherishes them carefully. To show the Khedive and his Government that the mosque of Sultan Hassan is more beautiful than that of Hassaneyn will perhaps be an impossible task; but it will be quite possible to show them that we care nothing for the one, and would at all hazards save the other.

BLESSINGS OF A REPUBLIC.

POETS and romance writers have frequently dilated on the blessings of freedom, and some of them, backed by a contingent of political philosophers, have proceeded to demonstrate that these blessings can never be properly enjoyed except under a democratic republican system. All the prejudice against Republics, say the philosophers, arises from an idol of the study, the habit of constantly referring to the slave-holding aristocracies of Greece and the close corporations of the Italian middle ages as examples of Republicanism. Now just at this moment an agreeable opportunity presents itself of examining at a very little distance from our shores the blessings of a Republic in full actuality and force. France is but a few years from the completion of the century since she first tried experiments in the Republican direction; and though her

experience has been chequered meanwhile, practice on three different occasions ought to have made her nearly perfect by this time, as Republican perfection goes. There are several curious points which might be selected and examined on this subject. There is, for instance, the remarkable state of the population, which nobody doubts to be due to the very Republican law, in operation now continuously for three generations, of equal, or nearly equal, division of inheritance. There is the growth of patriotism and public spirit manifested in different ways in the Tunisian and Egyptian businesses. There are half a dozen other pleasant considerations of the same kind which might be followed out with much amusement and profit. But for the present it may be well to confine observation, and not suffer it to take a too extensive view. The degree of personal freedom enjoyed under this Republic, the blessings of living in it as a citizen, as recently illustrated, may supply sufficient matter for the present discourse.

Some simple souls wondered that the excellent Mlle. Louise Michel appeared lately to prefer the institutions and ways of monarchic and antiquated England to those of Republican and enlightened France. But when Mlle. Michel thus expressed herself, the most modern instances of all, the fate of Prince Napoleon and Prince Krapotkine, had not occurred to confirm her in her views. These two things, with the circumstances attending on the first of them, afford almost inexhaustible uses of comment on the blessings of a Republic. A foolish and rather despicable person publishes a pompous and decidedly ridiculous Manifesto. Supposing that this Manifesto contained direct excitations to civil dissension, it is very doubtful whether a Republic theoretically has the right to take notice of it, for obviously there can be no "loyalty" or "disloyalty" to such a Constitution. It simply gives itself out to be the will of the majority, and anybody has a right to take any peaceable means to turn the majority into a minority. Giving this point up, however, no jurist of any weight has yet contended that Prince Napoleon's Manifesto could be regarded as a political offence except under the most sensitive of despotisms. In Ireland, though the country is in a sort of minor state of siege, things infinitely more disloyal to the existing laws and Constitution are constantly uttered with impunity, but a Republic has proved that it can be as sensitive as the most touchy of despotisms. It has done more. Because one Pretender has done a silly thing, an arbitrary measure of disfranchisement and disqualification is urged against other Pretenders, as they are called, who have done nothing at all. But, it will be said, this is only the zeal of the Republican house eating French Republicans up. The very idea of a possible sovereign is so abominable to their pure souls that they cannot bear the presence of the personal representatives of that idea when they imprudently make themselves prominent. Let us then take train from Paris to Lyons. Prince Krapotkine, though a prince by title, is certainly no advocate of monarchy. The ingenuity of his judges could find no positive charge of any kind of overt act whatever to bring against him, and it would puzzle any one of them to say, in Republican language and out of legal jargon, what he was sentenced for. But his Republican doxy was a different doxy from that which just for the moment is recognised in France, and that was enough. An Anarchist and Nihilist at one end of the scale is punished in this model Republic, not for any overt act, but for being an Anarchist and a Nihilist. Royalist heirs presumptive at the other end are punished, or threatened with punishment, not for any overt act, but for being Royalist heirs presumptive. *Stet pro ratione voluntas*; it must be acknowledged that the Republic has at least the merits of promptness and decision in its dealings with its Doctor Fells.

An imaginary conversation between the two Princes and some religious person would bring out very agreeably the blessings of living under a Republic. The benighted believer in God would be able to tell how his friends and relations had had their houses broken into and had been expelled from the country, for no other crime except preferring, in accordance with a general, if not universal, tradition of Christendom, to pray and work in common; he would be able to show that the object of the Republic, to a great extent already attained, is that he should not be permitted to send his children to any school where his religion is taught, its symbols displayed, or its dogmas treated with even a decent neutrality of respect. He might point out that while such strict supervision was exercised over the intrusion of religion into education, a late Minister of Education, just before attaining that dignity, beguiled the rare moments spared from cutting up animals alive by putting into a three-franc handbook all the most obscene passages he could cull from the writings of the Jesuits. He would remind his hearers that it is proposed in effect to prevent him from laying a cross of flowers on the grave of a dead friend. All these things, whether actually done or only threatened, are done by Republicans of the purest breed in the name of the Republic, and with the express plea that only by doing them can the Republic flourish. It is true that there is nearly as much "example for 't" as Malvolio produced in another case; and that the French Republic is only doing over again, and for the second time, in the case of Christianity generally, what the English Commonwealth did two centuries and a half ago in the case of the Anglican form of it. The circumstances being sufficiently different, but the form of government the same, it would appear on the general principles of inductive logic that Republicanism and intolerance have something more than a merely accidental connection.

The dialogue, however, would hardly be complete without a fresh interlocutor. An Englishman, whether sympathising or not

with the other three, could make an agreeable contribution to the subject by detailing what has been done, or is proposed to be done, in England. He would be able to recount how Sir Charles Dilke thinks it a grave question whether one man should be allowed to possess more than a certain amount of property; how Mr. Jesse Collings pines for the time when the criminal who feeds a pheasant or encourages a partridge to breed shall meet with appropriate and condign punishment; and of the great Man of Birmingham himself he would have many pleasant tales to tell. How Mr. Chamberlain sighs for the time when the villanous subscribers to a school will be prevented from relieving their neighbours, the other ratepayers and taxpayers, of a great part of the expense, except on the condition of having a system of education which they conscientiously abhor followed therein, would furnish a pleasant subject. The doctrine of the equal distribution of luxuries and that of the proper proportioning of income to wants, and not to earnings or possessions, would not be new to Continental ears, but its application in the ideal Republic would form a pretty text of discourse. In that happy state matters will, it is to be presumed, be arranged thus:—A keeps an orchid house. To him will enter nine sons of toil, who have not orchid houses, with a warrant from the mayor of the community for an equal distribution of luxuries in the shape of the orchids into ten parts. B, by the toil of his workmen (if workmen are allowed), sets up a carriage, and the Town Council will instantly issue a precept that Mrs. B. shall take turn and turn about in its use with the wives of the producers. This would be an undoubted blessing for the workmen; but whether under the circumstances B. would care to set up a carriage or keep workmen at all may be a matter for statesmen to ponder. Probably, however, a law would be passed obliging every one possessing an income over a certain amount to contribute in this way to the general comfort. For it is one of the peculiar delusions of Republicans that anything can be done by a law, and this, indeed, is the source of many of the choicest blessings of living under such a form of government. But, behindhand as we are in many respects, the English delegate would have one blessing of a Republic to tell his friends, which is believed to be unknown in France. The French Republicans have already drawn up a considerable number of "Thou shalt nots." A man may not suggest that a Republic is not an ideal and immutable form of government, or he shall go to the Conciergerie. He may not be his father's son, or, if he insists on being so, it is proposed that he shall cease to wear a French uniform, and to dwell on French soil. He may not even suggest the carrying out of Republican ideas more thoroughly and consistently, or, if he does, he gets five years' imprisonment with "trimmings." He may not pray and fast in company with others; he may not teach the Christian religion; he may not have his children taught that religion as he likes and where he likes. This is a goodly list of the fruits of that noble thing freedom—a fragrant anthology of instances of the manner in which the *Volonté Générale* insists in the freest and most Republican manner that a man shall not say or do or even think the thing he will. But one Republican improvement, one finest flower, does not seem to have been introduced into France. They have exclusive Clubs in that country; the Parisian Jockey Club, for instance, is not reputed easy of entrance. It is not likely that M. Floquet, or M. Clémenceau, or M. Paul Bert would solicit admission into that sacred but idle body. They are all men of serious minds. But if they did, and if they were blackballed, is it probable that they would seek the succour of the sympathising law? We doubt it. Perhaps it is the result of French susceptibility to ridicule, but the choicest blessing of Republican principles and practice, the law "Thou shalt not blackball under penalties," has certainly not yet been put in action in France.

THE CHURCH QUARTERLY ON THE MARRIAGE LAW.

THE unsavoury question of Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister has lately been again brought to the front, partly from the very active part the Earl of Dalhousie has thought proper to take in renewing the agitation, partly from the narrowness of the majority which threw out the Bill in the House of Lords last Session, "chiefly and above all"—to quote a writer in the current number of the *Church Quarterly*—"owing to the prominent action taken in the matter by certain illustrious personages (one especially) who, on ordinary occasions, consider it a duty to abstain from anything which bears the least appearance of political partisanship." The past history of the measure so persistently pressed forward by a wealthy and unscrupulous clique of malcontents during the last forty years, since its first introduction into the Commons in 1842, may be briefly summarized in the words of the same writer:—

It has been four times thrown out in the Commons; it has once passed a second reading in the Commons, and broken down on the motion that the Speaker do leave the Chair; it has three times passed a second reading in the Commons, and broken down in Committee; it has once been sent up to the Lords from the Commons, and withdrawn without a division; it has been five times sent up from the Commons to the Lords, and thrown out by them; and it has been five times initiated in the Lords, and rejected there. The recrudescence of this restless and interested agitation for a change of the law has naturally led to the formation of a Marriage Law Defence Union, as also to the appearance of a timely article on the subject in the *Church Quarterly* for January. It will not

then be out of place to offer some remarks here, partly in connexion with that article, on a topic where there is not indeed much room left for saying anything new, but where it becomes necessary, in view of a persistent aggression, to restate from time to time with fresh emphasis and precision considerations which are not the less weighty because they are or ought to be familiar, while on the other side they are studiously ignored without having ever been refuted. On the Scriptural argument, to which both parties usually turn in the first place, we do not propose to dwell at any length, though it is impossible altogether to pass it over. And here it may be observed that the Levitical code of prohibited degrees endorses, while—as might be expected—it in some respects goes beyond, the marriage legislation of Pagan Rome, which equally, to use Milman's words, "extended its prohibitions to connexions formed by affinity," on the principle that "connexions formed by marriage were as sacred as those of natural kindred." The prohibition to marry a wife's daughter or son's wife was indeed expressly founded on the principle that "both are daughters," and it was unlawful to marry a stepmother or mother-in-law because "they are in the place of a mother." It is true that the Roman law did allow marriage with a wife's sister; but it also, like nearly all modern codes which permit such unions—allowed marriage with a niece. The Bishop of Lincoln, in an address cited by the reviewer, urges with much force (the italics are his own) that the Table of Prohibited Degrees in Leviticus "is no part of the Levitical Law, as such, but is a Marriage Code promulgated to all nations by God Himself, who exterminated the Canaanites (who knew nothing of the Levitical Law) for violating it;" and he proceeds to argue, as does the reviewer at greater length, that "marriage with a deceased wife's sister is prohibited, not in a single verse, but in the general framework of that Code," which forbids all marriage with those "near of kin" to the wife, this nearness being extended, alike in cases of consanguinity and affinity, to the third degree of relationship. The reviewer insists on the fuller enforcement of this code in the New Testament—where we should naturally expect to find a stricter and more perfect law—and thus sums up, fairly enough, the reasonable canons for its interpretation:—

1. Interpret the code as a whole, regarding it as the exposition of a clear principle, allowing of no exceptions unless these are absolutely required by the plain grammatical meaning of its terms.

2. Admit the principle that not all prohibited degrees are stated, but that many are left to be inferred by parity of reasoning from those which do find expression in words.

3. Do not extend the principle of interpretation so as to make it involve prohibitions of a kind to which there is no parallel in the expressed precepts.

On this method of interpretation a sister's wife is of course necessarily included. And if that be once granted, the clenching force of the New Testament argument as bearing on it at once follows:—

We have arrived, then, at this point in our argument: that any legislation inaugurated or confirmed in express terms by our Lord during His earthly ministry acquires thereby a moral and universal character, as distinguished from all ritual, ceremonial, or civil precepts which bore a transitory or national, and therefore limited, character; that our Lord did legislate very emphatically on the subject of marriage, reasserting the ancient but forgotten principle that a man and his wife are one flesh; that in the New Testament certain sins are denounced as incestuous, because they come under a ban which owes its entire existence to considerations of affinity or relationship by marriage; and that certain etymological and historical considerations suggest a probability that the *propreia* forbidden by the Council of Jerusalem might be the practice of marrying within degrees which were not prohibited under the Roman law, but which were prohibited under the law henceforth to be observed by Christians.

But whatever speculative difficulties may be raised as to the Scriptural argument, there can be no doubt at all about the historical fact—which for all Christians at least must have considerable weight—that for the first fourteen, if not fifteen, centuries (we will explain presently our sole ground for admitting the possible alternative) Scripture was universally understood throughout the Church, both in the East and West, to prohibit the unions which it is now sought to get legalized in England. This is a matter not of opinion but of fact, which rests on decisive evidence. Dr. Pusey stated the case with his wonted accuracy of detail in a work published more than thirty years ago, when he was examined before a Royal Commission on the Marriage Law. Three distinct stages may be traced with regard to the prohibition of marriage between those near of kin, whether by blood or affinity, in the Christian Church. Until the beginning of the sixth century all marriages held to be forbidden expressly or by implication in Scripture, and those alone—that is, the same as are included in the "Table of Kindred and Affinity" appended to the English Prayer-book—were absolutely forbidden by the Church as incestuous. Between the sixth century and the end of the eleventh various other canonical restrictions on marriage were gradually introduced in the West, which however were not held to rest on Divine law, and were therefore not enforced on newly converted individuals or nations, but no dispensations were as yet brought into use. From the end of the eleventh century to the end of the fifteenth, dispensations were occasionally granted to individuals in the Western Church, but only for marriages prohibited by ecclesiastical law, and only to crowned heads and on urgent grounds of public interest, while the prohibitions of Scripture were still held to be of Divine law, and therefore indispensable. In the East dispensations have never been allowed. The first dispensation within the Levitical degrees is generally said to be that granted by Alexander VI.

in 1500 to Emanuel, King of Portugal, to marry the sister of his deceased wife, and it is worth noting that the same Pope afterwards gave permission to Ferdinand, King of Sicily, to marry his aunt. Soon afterwards followed the famous dispensation granted by Julius II. to Henry VIII. to marry his brother's widow, but here it is again important to remember how much stress was laid throughout the whole controversy on the alleged fact, to which Catherine herself deposed on oath, that her previous marriage with Arthur had not been consummated. Dr. Pusey observes that the absence of any such dispensation for fifteen centuries was no mere accident. "It was the deliberate mind of the Western Church [as it still is of the Eastern], her Councils, her Popes, her Schoolmen, and her Canonists that (the prohibition of) these marriages was a part of the unchangeable Divine law; and Popes, Schoolmen, and Canonists deliberately taught that the Popes could not dispense within those (Levitical) degrees." Innocent III. expressly replied in this sense to a question addressed to him, and yet few pontiffs have ever been more ready to extend to the utmost the privileges of their See. What is still more important, a similar answer was given by Cardinal Turrecremata when Eugenius IV. directed him to examine the question, and he adds that "supposing it had ever been done or should be done by any Pope ignorant of the Divine Law or blinded by avarice, it does not follow that he had the right to do it." This clause probably points to the only alleged instance of the kind before Alexander VI., namely, the dispensation said to have been granted by Martin V., the predecessor of Eugenius, in 1427 to a certain Count Fuxius to marry his deceased wife's sister. Dr. Pusey says, but without giving his authority, that what Martin V. really did was to legalize a marriage contracted long before between a man and the sister, not of a previous wife, but of a woman with whom he had had illicit relations, and, if so, it would not be strictly a case in point. This statement, however, is not borne out by the *Annals of Raynaldus*; in Creighton's recently published *History of the Papacy* there is no reference to the subject. But at all events it is an isolated example of any such dispensation before the end of the fifteenth century, and the judgment of Eugenius IV., Martin's successor, who refused the dispensation applied for, implies that it was not to be made a precedent.

But while the notorious case of Henry VIII. was still fresh in men's minds, the Council of Trent assembled, and finding it impossible to avoid the burning question of marriage dispensations, while it probably desired neither to condemn the acts of two recent Popes nor to commend them to imitation, passed a decree very cautiously worded, which however completely revolutionized the existing discipline of the Church on the subject. It runs thus:—"Si quis dixerit eos tantum consanguinitatis et affinitatis gradus qui Levitico exprimuntur posse impedire matrimonium contrahendum et dirimere contractum, nec posse Ecclesiam in nonnullis eorum dispensare, anathema sit." In the original draft of the decree the last clause runs, "nec posse Ecclesiam constituere ut plures aut pauciores impediant aut dirimant," and many bishops, as we learn from Massarelli's *Acta*, objected to the insertion of "pauciores." It will be observed however that power is claimed for the Church to dispense "in some" Levitical degrees only, without specifying which, and that no distinction is drawn between consanguinity and affinity. Moreover the Council proceeded in the same Session to decree that a dispensation "should never be granted in the second degree, except between great princes and for a public cause," and hence it seems natural to infer, from no mention being made of the first degree (which would include the wife's sister), that no dispensation in such cases ought to be granted. Fagnan, a distinguished Italian canonist, accordingly maintained that the Council forbade such dispensations altogether, while Estius, who died in 1613, says that only one instance of the kind had up to his time occurred; towards the close of the same century Innocent XI., one of the best and ablest of the modern Popes, uniformly refused them. They have however become common enough since then, showing how impossible it is to draw the line when once a principle is relaxed. Dr. Pusey urges in a painfully significant passage that on any Scriptural argument, whether critical or as understood by the Church, the marriage of uncle and niece stands on just the same footing as that with the deceased wife's sister, and adds:—"Both prohibitions were enforced during the purest ages of the Church, both relaxed in evil times by dispensations from the Pope; both continue to be forbidden in the Greek Church; both were, after the model of the Primitive Church, anew forbidden among ourselves; both were discouraged at first by the Protestants abroad; both are since allowed by them—one altogether, the other by dispensation from the civil power; both take place, by dispensation of the Pope, in Roman Catholic countries; both practically take place where allowed." And it is difficult to escape his conclusion that "it is simply absurd to suppose that, if the English mind be familiarized with the one, the other will be far off."

The practical warning indeed to be derived from the condition of Continental countries, where generally speaking both these marriages, as well as others, still happily forbidden in England, are allowed, either with dispensation or without it, would alone supply a terribly cogent argument against the proposed change of the law. In the United States the late Mr. Justice Story declared marriage with a deceased wife's sister to be considered "the best sort of marriage," and "in a moral, religious, and Christian sense, exceedingly praiseworthy." Both

there, and on the Continent, as Bishop Wordsworth remarks, "incestuous marriages, conjugal unfaithfulness, and facility of divorce are now rife, and are producing consequences which we may well shrink from describing, and even from contemplating." The *Church Quarterly* however cites a letter addressed by an American clergyman to the late Lord Hatherley, and published by him, which gives so portentous a description of what would inevitably and speedily become the case in our own country, if the advocates of "marriage law reform" could have their evil will, that we make no apology for putting it on record here:—

"It is evident," writes an American clergyman, "to those of us who are old enough to remember the state of things previous to these innovations, that a change for the worse has been brought about. I can well recollect when ladies in the lifetimes of their husbands used to feel as if their brothers-in-law were their own brothers, and to treat them accordingly, in all the unreserve of domestic intercourse; when a brother-in-law after an absence would kiss his brother's wife in all purity as his own sister, and she would confide in him without a thought of evil or a feeling of embarrassment; and when, too, in case of a wife dying, her sister would remain in charge of her family, or would remove to the bereaved home, to live with the widower, and take care of his children as a thing of course, without a whisper of slander, or any occasion for it; when the children, too, knowing that their aunt could never be in any nearer relation to them, loved and revered her, and confided in her, and yielded readily a most wholesome influence to her.

"But since such increased nearness of connexion has been deemed not improper and even desirable, there has grown up in families a perceptible and painful constraint; the children learning to look with apprehension on their mother's sisters, and the wives becoming jealous of their influence with their husbands, while familiarities which formerly were thought to be, and really were, innocent, have come to possess a consciousness of evil tendency which itself is of the nature of sin.

"I know of a wife whose health was gradually declining—a woman of the world, with a husband as worldly as herself, and in their house was a young and attractive sister of hers, between whom and her husband there had grown up gradually a degree of affectionate intercourse, which in the days of the wife's health had been thought only natural. But as her end drew near, it became on his part more pointed, and drew to it her attention so agonizingly that it became the one engrossing feeling of her soul for the last few weeks of her life, exciting in her an undisguised dread of what she foresaw would, as it did, take place, and so absorbed her as to shut out all thought of religion and make her miserable to her very death."

Considering how persistently the fallacious pretext of relieving the poor is put forward by the innovating party, it should be steadily borne in mind that one result of the Royal Commission was to prove how entirely and exclusively the agitation is really being carried on in the interests of the rich. Out of 1,648 of the so-called marriages which were then found to have taken place within the forbidden degrees, only forty had occurred among the poor. In a carefully drawn statement of "Plain Facts," issued by Mr. Beresford Hope, we read that "the cases which can be shown of concubinage between men and their sisters-in-law are only a small percentage of that vast mass of concubinage, incestuous and otherwise, which is so great a national sin." But after all the fact that it would substitute for a Table of Degrees resting on a clear and consistent principle an arbitrary code resting on no principle whatever, supplies alone the sufficient and conclusive condemnation of the proposed change. For to allow marriage with a wife's sister and forbid it with a wife's niece, or a husband's brother, is absurd on the face of it. And what, as the reviewer justly asks, about the other relationships of affinity? "It cannot be too often repeated that all must stand or fall together," as a too abundant experience has already proved to be invariably the case. "Wherever," to quote Mr. Beresford Hope once more, "either by general law or by way of an exception, a man can marry his sister-in-law or his niece-in-law, there also under the same conditions he can marry his blood-niece, daughter of his brother or his sister, and his blood-aunt, sister of his father or his mother. This is now the law of France and of Germany, and of nearly all the Continent." *Absit omen!*

GUSTAVE DORÉ.

FEW people of judgment will be found to disagree with M. Doré's statement concerning himself as set down by M. Albert Wolff in the pages of the *Figaro*, that in his case "the illustrator killed the painter," although the phrase may be interpreted with a meaning slightly different from that which the artist himself probably intended it to bear. Indeed, M. Doré's complaints of the non-recognition by the Parisian critics and public of his merits as a great painter may fairly take rank with the many instances, authentic or not, of comic actors who have believed that it was the public's fault, not theirs, that they were not accepted as ideal heroes of tragedy—that it was not their own shortcomings, but the denseness of professional and unprofessional critics, which denied them this privilege. Such things have happened before in the history of painting; they happened, but in a more marked degree, in the case of an English artist who had some things in common with Doré—Cruikshank. His efforts in oils were, to be sure, very much below Doré's in technical skill; but, like Doré, he was great as an illustrator and disappointing as a painter; and, also like Doré, it was his grasp of imagination, rather than his skill as a draughtsman, that marked his illustrations as the work of a man who had an undoubted touch of genius. That there was this touch in Doré's work as an illustrator will hardly be denied by any who know his illustrations to Balzac's *Contes Drolatiques*, or his representation of various stages in the career of the Wandering Jew, ending with the grim

figure of the Jew at last taking off his shoes with a look of unearthly relief in the midst of the great and universal catastrophe. Here there is distinct genius, untrained, as Doré's genius always was, but admirably fitted to deal with the subject in the manner chosen. One has but to conceive the same thing attempted on a grand scale as an oil picture to get some idea of why Doré fell short in his attempt to add to his great and well-deserved fame as an illustrator an equally great fame as a painter. In an illustration, up to a certain point, almost any faults of execution may be pardoned if only it is evident that the illustrator has formed a wide and imaginative idea of the thing to be illustrated, and has succeeded in conveying his own idea to those who look at his work. Often enough, as in some of the illustrations of the *Inferno* and of *Orlando Furioso*, Doré overstepped the limit which may fairly be allowed to bad draughtsmanship in consideration of imaginative power and daring execution; but, speaking broadly, the faults of his draughtsmanship were condoned, if not covered, by the genius which made itself felt through them. This was the case even in the Tennyson illustrations, where, in many cases, the vastness and originality of the conception outweigh the sometimes obtrusive faults. The ill-drawn and ill-placed figures are of little importance in comparison with the splendid suggestion of the scene to which they belong. The faults, however, which may be passed over in an illustration are less easily tolerated in a picture, and least easily tolerated in such pictures as it seems to have been Doré's especial ambition to produce as masterpieces. The sacred subjects which he attempted demand a dignity to which scarcely any painter of this day has attained. Doré, to begin with, had no conception of what a sacred subject really is; and he certainly did not attain even technical dignity. Further, these subjects demand, even supposing that the feeling of dignity is present in the artist's conception, that little thing no bigger than one's finger, as it has been called by a fine artist in another branch of art—*l'instruction*. It was precisely this which Doré wanted, and it is precisely this without which no art that aims high can fulfil the conditions demanded by high aims.

We have credited Doré with genius; and it is, as it seems to us, as undeniable that he had genius as it is that Robson had genius. What Robson might have done as an actor, what Doré might have done as a painter, had both cultivated their gifts in a different way at the time when cultivation is of the highest importance, is matter for fancy rather than for opinion. Both excelled in a strange commingling of the grotesque and the terrible, and neither could reach that nearest approach to perfection in pure art which has been reached by artists of possibly less ardent and certainly more restrained temperament. It was Doré's misfortune that he did not recognize the limits which want of training imposed upon his capacities. He had, it may be presumed both from the internal evidence of his work and from what has been written of him since his death, a repugnance, and a not unnatural repugnance, to the pedantries with which art is sometimes surrounded, and he lacked the wit to distinguish between what is unnecessary formalism and what is necessary restriction. His imagination was unusually powerful, and he did not or would not recognize the fact that imagination will not suffice to produce a great picture unless it goes hand in hand with thought, study, finish—in a word, with art. Nor would it seem unlikely that on the question of imagination alone Doré was sometimes misled by his temperament; that he mistook the theatrical for the dramatic, the pretentious for the noble; and that, when he had produced an effect which was in one sense big he was satisfied that he had done a thing which was great. The picture of "Christ leaving the Prætorium" leads one to think that this may have been the case, and as an illustration of the painter's artistic feeling is further curious for the many repetitions of the same type of face and expression which may be noted in it, and especially noted among the Roman soldiery. To compare this more ambitious than happy effort with Doré's best work as an illustrator is, in a different degree, like comparing Cruikshank's picture in the National Gallery with his illustration of Fagin in the condemned cell, or with some of the illustrations to Ainsworth's romances. Doré's genius was essentially for the romantic, and especially for that form of the romantic which is associated most nearly with the phrase "the romantic school." It was his to exhibit with his pencil the mixed emotions which pedantry did its best to keep out of French literature and art, until the beginning of the movement which fought and won a hard fight in the 1830 period. He was, as has been justly said of him, a brilliant rebel; but, like many rebels in history, he lacked discipline. Discipline might have taught him, if common sense did not, not only that nothing great in the highest branch of art can be attained without at least an attempt at the highest finish, but also that it is impossible to use the materials and methods of one branch of art for a branch which is entirely different. A true painter may paint a picture bigger in size than Doré's or smaller than M. Meissonier's, and it shall still be a picture which is in its place in a private collection or a public gallery, and not, as with Doré's big pictures, a sort of *tour de force* on the part of a man charged with artistic instincts of a certain sort, and unable to distinguish between the requirements of the art of the painter and of the art of the scene-painter. There have been and there are now living artists who have been painters and scene-painters both; but they have acquired their double honours by the hardest of training, and they have never mixed up the functions of two branches of art in neither of which was Doré a past master. He had a singular breadth of imagination, and he

aimed at a striking breadth of execution, forgetting or neglecting the fact that only he who has mastered detail can hope to deal successfully with breadth, that breadth is in fact the massing of detail, and that when the component parts are faulty the whole result cannot be effective. From the causes touched upon Doré failed as a painter; but as an illustrator, as a master of the one branch of art in which, as we have said, much may be forgiven in consideration of the possession and display of a touch of genius, his greatness is undoubted. His disappearance makes, it may fairly be said, a gap which no living artist can fill; and his loss will be sincerely and justly felt, both by artists and by a wider public than that which cares for the niceties of art.

COLLISIONS AT SEA.

AFTER the first short voyage or trial trip of a great passenger steamer a description of her, more or less detailed according to her size, not infrequently appears in one of the daily papers. It may usually be observed that a description of this kind is extremely laudatory, and that it precisely resembles such an account as might be expected from the builders, bearing indeed a striking resemblance to an elaborate advertisement. These descriptions are not, however, given as advertisements, nor is their authorship openly assigned to builders, owners, or other interested people; but they are published as if they came from independent writers who had examined and observed for themselves. Now there can be no possible objection to laying before the world a full account of a great vessel written by the man who has designed her or superintended her construction; but there is a most serious objection to allowing such an account to appear in a manner which leaves the impression that it is the work of an independent expert, competent to observe and to verify statements. Of course the descriptions referred to may be written by unbiassed men, but a suspicion must be felt that they are not, but are, if not composed, at all events entirely based on information supplied by constructors who naturally are extremely pleased with their own work.

In these panegyrics on new vessels which are sometimes so fervent that it seems impossible to attribute them to anything but the strong love which a man has for his own creations, one statement, very comforting to those who travel by water, will generally be found. It is usually alleged that the ship is divided into watertight compartments, so that, if the water gets into one of these, it will not get any further. The vessel may therefore spring a bad leak, or even have a big hole made in her, without danger of sinking. This statement, so often made about new steamers, certainly snacks of that interested enthusiasm which prevents men from distinguishing between truth and falsehood, for it is about as true as the stories of cures by quack medicines. When a modern steamer sustains serious damage, the so-called watertight bulkheads are never, with the exception of the collision bulkhead, of any real avail to prevent foundering, and the vessel sinks much as the old wooden ships used to do. How untrustworthy these much vaunted metal partitions are we have pointed out several times; but, unfortunately, it requires a great disaster on our own shores to make men realize the weakness of modern ships, and the compartments and the bulkheads were generally believed in until three weeks ago, when the collision in the Mersey caused a marvellously sudden and general expression of scepticism as to their worth. Since the loss of the *City of Brussels*, there has been the far more terrible catastrophe in the North Sea. Whether the *Cimbria* was fitted with watertight bulkheads has not been stated; but in all probability she was constructed as other passenger steamers are, and was supposed to be divided into compartments. There is no doubt that these accidents have produced a general disbelief in this so-called safeguard, and it is to be hoped that the apprehension which has been excited may have some effect on shipowners by making the travelling public afraid of their vessels, and that ultimately safer ships may be built. What is thought about the boasted watertight compartments by those who are really conversant with shipbuilding will be best shown by quoting a passage from an article in the *Engineer* of January 12 on the loss of the *City of Brussels*. After speaking of sound-signalling, the writer said:—

Another question is, When will shipowners, or the Board of Trade, or "Lloyd's," or the Liverpool underwriters, take the bulkhead problem in hand? It is a noteworthy fact that this is a subject on which the Institution of Naval Architects never touches. Those who read papers and those who discuss them alike seem to regard the matter as tabooed. If it is referred to at all, it is so only in connexion with ships-of-war. We know that among shipbuilders there is a rooted contempt for bulkheads, and this is not to be wondered at, seeing that they themselves have done their utmost to make them contemptible. As they are usually fitted, they cost some money—no much it is true; they are a nuisance to the owners, coming as they do more or less in the way of cargo, and they are absolutely worthless. We shall feel indebted to any one of our numerous readers who can give us particulars of a single case in which bulkheads prevented a ship from foundering. We do not now refer to collision bulkheads, which are almost invariably well made, well designed, and therefore quite efficient. We refer to the other bulkheads, which, if as good, would be as useful. By only too many persons it is assumed that the modern passenger steamer is as safe as she can be made. The foundering of the *City of Brussels* is proof that she is not safe, and there is a universal consensus of opinion among engineers, at all events, that passenger steamers can be made much safer than they are.

The challenge here given was not accepted. Amongst the readers of the *Engineer* are doubtless those gentlemen who de-

scribe so neatly the merits of new vessels; but none of them took advantage of the editor's kindly offer to give space in his columns, and came forward to mention cases in which bulkheads had saved vessels from foundering. It may, then, without any undue assumption, be taken as certain that bulkheads, as now fitted, are of no avail to prevent sinking when there has been serious injury to a ship. They may slightly delay her going down; but, until the method of constructing them is totally changed, they will afford no real security against disaster.

One supposed safeguard against great loss of life in case of collision at sea is therefore non-existent, or all but non-existent; and perhaps the foundering of the *City of Brussels* and of the *Cimbria* may lead to this fact being at last recognized, and may cause attention to be drawn to the necessity of constructing vessels so as really to ensure safety. It may also be hoped that these terrible catastrophes will lead to more careful consideration of the means of preventing collisions than has yet been given to this very important question. There is no exaggeration in saying that, if anything like the feeling of just anger which has been excited by railway accidents were roused by accidents to passenger ships, collisions at least would be greatly lessened, and perhaps some such feeling may be evoked now that the great risk incurred at sea and the illusory nature of a supposed safeguard are made so clear. Public indignation cannot but have a good effect, inasmuch as the first and most important condition of greater safety is that there should be more caution in navigating steamers. It may seem strange that merchant officers in command should be in any way reckless, as the penalties for carelessness are decidedly not light. If a fatal accident is due to want of proper precaution on the part of a captain, he may be tried for manslaughter. In any case, if a captain has lost his vessel, or caused the loss of another, he must answer for his conduct to the Wreck Commissioners' tribunal, which does not make light of maritime disaster, and certainly does not err on the side of over-leniency. The punishments meted out by this body are extremely severe, more severe sometimes than they may seem to the general public. Suspension of a certificate, or even grave censure, may mean ruin to the officer condemned. Despite, however, the very severe penalties which await misconduct, it appears certain that great recklessness is not infrequently shown. We do not, of course, wish in any way whatever to prejudge the cases of the *City of Brussels* and *Kirby Hall*, or of the *Cimbria* and *Sultan*; but, when the result of a collision is that a large vessel sinks within twenty minutes or so, it seems clear that some one must be greatly to blame; and minor accidents on the coast have undoubtedly often been due to carelessness of danger. This recklessness probably results from the extreme encouragement which quick passages now receive. Not long ago there was much talk of the wonderful runs of the *Alaska*, the greyhound of the Atlantic, as she was called; and now a steamer is being built which is expected considerably to surpass even the *Alaska* in speed. We do not say that with this vessel any undue risk has been incurred; and certainly we do not accuse either of the masters of the ill-fated vessels which have been lost of over-anxiety for fast runs; indeed, it seems certain that the captain of the *City of Brussels* was in no undue hurry; but it is permissible to say that the general admiration for quick passages and the great popularity of the vessels which make them have engendered a spirit of recklessness and a tendency to disregard necessary precautions which must lead occasionally to serious disaster. The public like rapid passages, so the owners expect captains to make them, and the captains who, come what may, must stand well with their employers, get into the habit of disregarding what are sometimes unfortunately very real dangers. The evil habit thus generated has probably more or less affected other branches of the merchant service. The masters of cargo steamers follow the example of their more highly placed brethren, and probably find that, for various reasons, their employers like smart runs, and that the careful precautions which may occasionally lengthen a voyage are not always appreciated as they should be. Hence comes indifference to risk, and, sooner or later, its inevitable result follows. Every year the British waters become more and more crowded, and our climate certainly does not grow less foggy. More and more does precaution become necessary, but it is feared that the habit of neglecting, at times, necessary precautions has become very general.

If these accidents are to decrease instead of increasing, it is, in the first place, needful that there should be less of what may be called a bad go-ahead spirit amongst seamen and greater prudence; and nothing is more likely to bring about this desirable change than a strong manifestation of feeling such as that with which railway collisions are regarded. When owners and masters know that public opinion really and strongly condemns anything like running risks for the sake of shortening a passage, owners and masters will be more careful. Other changes, too, highly conducive to the safety of passengers may be expected if attention is once drawn to the dangers which beset ships in narrow seas. Owing to the size of modern steamers and to the consequent momentum of the blow they give even when going slowly, and to the weakness of an iron side as against a blow, a collision is now usually a more serious accident than it formerly was. As has been pointed out repeatedly, the straight stem, in which the naval architects of the day delight, is far more dangerous than the old curved stem. This struck a vessel first on her strongest part, and the force of the impact was to a certain extent deadened. The straight stem is, especially if a vessel is down by the stern, a very well contrived ram

striking the water-line at once and with full force, and doing as much damage as the speed of the ship will allow. This fact naval architects apparently view with indifference; but we venture to say that this would quickly vanish and that there would be a sudden desire to return to the graceful shape, if a series of verdicts with heavy damages, such as have been given against Railway Companies, were to show that juries are not indifferent to the deliberate adoption of a dangerous form of bow by constructors and owners. In other matters indifference of a similar kind might be happily cured by direct legislative measures. It would not perhaps be advisable to enact that every steamer shall have an overhanging bow, but it would probably be well to oblige the owners of great passenger-steamers to have them fitted with really watertight bulkheads, or, at all events, to adopt some system of classification which would show which vessels were fortified against danger and which were not. As has been said, the bulkheads now fitted are for the most part worthless; but it is quite possible to construct them so that they shall be really efficacious, and shipowners, instead of being merely under the necessity of getting a favourable notice in a newspaper, should be obliged to build their vessels in the proper way, unless they were willing to see them stigmatized as unsafe by being placed in a low class. Besides measures for rendering vessels more safe, others may well be demanded. The Rule of Road, albeit so lately re-edited with additions and alterations, is almost admittedly deficient in some respects. Now that the Channel and the waters adjacent are so crowded with ships at all times of the year, further and more detailed regulations than those contained in the brief code are required. At present there are optional signals by which a vessel may indicate that she is going to direct her course to port, to starboard, or that she is going astern. It would be highly desirable to extend this system, and in order to see how far this is practicable, there should be a careful investigation of the systems of sound-signalling which have been contrived. The writer of the article in the *Engineer* to which we have referred seems to think that some one of these might well be introduced. On this point it may be difficult to speak positively. To devise a method of sound-signalling which is likely to be practicable and efficacious is a matter of no small difficulty; and the probable results of any system should be carefully considered before it is adopted. That, however, there should be a careful examination of the systems proposed there can be no doubt. In addition to many comparatively small accidents, the two terrible collisions of which we have spoken have shown the danger of navigation in a fog; and, if any trustworthy method of sound-signalling by which this can be lessened has been devised, it cannot be too soon adopted.

LAST YEAR'S FRENCH WINE CROP.

THE influence of economic causes upon political development is strikingly illustrated just now in France. There is no country upon the Continent better able to bear adversity than France, owing to the wide distribution of property amongst the masses of the people and to their extraordinary industry and thrift. But even in France long-continued adversity is at last telling upon the national prosperity and bringing about dissatisfaction with the existing political order. It may be doubted, however, whether the dissatisfaction is as great or likely to be as enduring as many observers think. It will be recollected how quickly France recovered from the disasters of the war with Germany. Two or three years of patient labour and painstaking economy enabled her to meet all the charges caused by military defeat, so that to the casual observer it appeared as if she had suffered less than her victorious antagonist. But her disasters are much less now than they were then. The course of the seasons has been very adverse. Since 1874 there has not been a really good agricultural year, and to a country of peasant proprietors such a long succession of bad seasons is a great calamity. Here at home, as Sir M. Hicks-Beach reminded us the other day, the result to our landowners and farmers has been very serious; and in Ireland it has produced anarchy and widespread distress. In France it would at first sight appear that the results would be still worse, because France is a country of peasant proprietors, the proportion of the population directly dependent upon the soil being immensely larger than it is in England. Notwithstanding the great development of manufacturing industry in France during the present century, and the great accumulation of capital, it is still to be remembered that fully two-thirds of the wealth of France consists of land and houses. A succession of bad harvests would then seem a much more serious thing in France than in the United Kingdom. Yet the succession of bad seasons has been as long in France as it has been here, while until the present winter the effects have appeared very much less. Now, however, they are making themselves felt in a very acute form. It is not merely the cereal crops that have been bad. From time to time every crop throughout France has suffered. And it is further to be recollected that some of the years—1879 more particularly—were the worst known since 1816. But while all crops have suffered, and some very severely, one crop in particular has suffered more than all the rest, and indeed at one time appeared to be threatened with total extinction. We refer of course to the wine crop. This crop is one of the most important in France. It covers an area of about 5½ millions

of English acres—that is, fully 50 per cent. more than the area under wheat in the United Kingdom. Or, to put the matter somewhat differently, for every two acres under wheat in the United Kingdom there are at least three under vines in France. The magnitude of the interest, then, is beyond dispute. And when it is further borne in mind that, owing to the multitude of peasant proprietors in France, the number of persons dependent upon the industry is out of all proportion larger than the number of persons dependent upon any single crop in the United Kingdom, it will be seen that the matter is very serious. The effect of the bad seasons has been immensely aggravated by the phylloxera; and the two together have at times threatened the total extinction of this great industry in France.

From a report inserted in the *Bulletin de Statistique* it appears that the production of wine in France from 1860 to 1869, both inclusive, averaged 50 millions of hectolitres, and that during the eight following years it rose to an average of 54 millions of hectolitres. But since 1878 the production has ranged from 25 millions to 35 millions of hectolitres. The lowest production was in 1879, an exceptionally bad year, and 1880 was also very bad; 1881, however, showed a recovery, but last year there was again a serious falling off. The aggregate production of the whole of France amounted to no more than 30,886,352 hectolitres, being a decrease from the average of the period 1870-1878 of about 43 per cent. In other words, the wine harvest last year was little more than half the average of the eight years that followed the war. What an enormous loss this must have been to the proprietors of the 5½ millions of acres planted with vines is at once apparent. And the loss was the more serious as it followed three years of exceptionally bad yield. Of course it does not follow that, however much the individual grower may have suffered, the loss to France as a nation has been anything like 43 per cent. The difference in price between the common *vin ordinaire* and the wines specially prized abroad is immense, and if the falling off was chiefly in the common and cheaper wines, the loss to France would of course be greatly reduced. No statistics, however, can show accurately these points. It would require a minute and prolonged inquiry by qualified experts to ascertain the exact loss in each quality of wine. It is, however, to be borne in mind that there was a great falling off in quality as well as in quantity. The decrease in production was only partly due to the phylloxera. Even more largely it was attributable to the seasons; more particularly the falling off of last year as compared with the year before was due to bad weather. In the spring of last year there were high hopes of a good yield; but frosts occurring in June inflicted widespread damage throughout the centre, East, and West of France, and this damage was completed by the rains of the harvest. In the South, on the contrary, the season was fairly favourable, and there the returns have been much better. The bad weather not only caused a great diminution in the yield, it injured seriously the quality. The wine was not only poor as regards strength, but was sour also in many cases, the grapes having never properly ripened. If, then, the mere falling off in quantity gives no accurate indication of the national loss to France because of the diversity of quality in the wines produced, so, on the other hand, it rather underestimates the loss due to the deterioration in the quality of the wine produced. But, taking the lowest estimate of the loss, and bearing in mind the number of years through which the falling off has now continued, it will be seen that the result to the wine-growers throughout the country must be disastrous, and largely accounts for the feeling of *malaise* and unrest that prevails. Year after year the peasant proprietors have seen their property wasting away before their eyes in consequence of bad weather, and there seems no end to the series of adverse seasons by which they are visited. There appears, however, one gleam of sunshine amidst the gloom. The Report to which we have referred informs us that the area under vines increased last year, as compared with the year before, suggesting that the wine-growers are recovering courage, and think they have found the means of checking the ravages of the phylloxera. They find by experience that certain kinds of American vines resist the disease, and they are largely planting those vines, not so much for their own production as to serve for the grafting of the French vines. When so grafted, the French vines, it appears, are protected from the disease. The Report reminds us that, thirty years ago, the French vines were attacked by a disease that was still more destructive, and that for a time threatened the total extinction of vine culture in France. It was, however, overcome; and the authors of the Report hope that the worst of the phylloxera has now been seen, and that wine-growing in France will recover its old prosperity.

The falling off in the home production has led to a great importation of foreign wines, chiefly from Spain. The misfortunes of France have thus benefited Spain, and in the latter country vine culture is rapidly extending, while the wine trade was never so prosperous. In addition, the wine-makers of France are making wine from dried raisins, not to speak of other adulterations, and they are thus producing almost as much wine as they did before the phylloxera attacked the vines. But adulteration, of course, is lowering the character of French wine abroad, and is a serious danger to the future of the French trade. If it comes to be generally believed that French wine is adulterated, France will in the long run lose the command of the markets of the world. In the meantime, however, the trade, as distinct from the wine-growers, seems to be doing fairly well, and France, as a whole,

escapes a part of the loss that would otherwise have fallen upon her. She of course receives a certain profit upon this manufactured wine; but, as she has to pay for the imports from abroad, and for the dried fruits and other materials which she uses in manufacturing the artificial wine, her profit is small compared to what it would be if the old production of the country had been maintained. Thus not only are the wine-growers impoverished by the continued bad seasons and by the phylloxera, but the trade itself is less profitable than it used to be. The export of wine is small compared with the internal consumption, and even for the home consumption France has to import large quantities. The result is that, instead of producing enough for her own consumption and having a surplus to sell, she has now to import foreign wine to satisfy her home consumption. For the ten years 1872-1881, the imports of wine into France averaged annually only 2,312,000 hectolitres; whereas last year they rose to 6,541,000 hectolitres. Thus the imports last year were nearly three times as much as the average imports of the preceding ten years; while, compared with 1872, they were nearly thirteen times greater. It was not, in fact, until 1878 that the imports became really large. On the other hand, the exports for the ten years ended with 1881 averaged 3,173,000 hectolitres; while last year the exports amounted to no more than 2,398,000 hectolitres, or not much more than one-third in quantity of the imports.

THE THEATRES.

WE have not infrequently had occasion in these columns to discuss the merits and faults of the series of plays written by the late T. W. Robertson, to which attention has just been directed afresh by the final revival, under the management of Mr. and Mrs. Bancroft, of *Caste*, which is the most telling, as it is on the whole the most artistic, of the series. In the present performance the play is seen to the best advantage in some important points. The two parts originally played by Mr. and Mrs. Bancroft are still in their hands, and they could not be in better hands, and the playing of certain of the other parts by actors new to them is of striking value. Chiefly this is the case with the Marquise de St. Maur of Mrs. Stirling and the Eccles of Mr. James. Both these characters offer temptations to over-acting—not perhaps to over-acting in the abstract, but to a kind of emphasis which is out of place in the surroundings. Whether this is in the nature of the writing, whether these characters are more broadly and strongly marked by the author than are the others, it would be difficult to determine without a careful analysis of the text. What is certain is that the part of the Marquise has never been so well played as it is now, and that, admirable as Mr. Honey's Eccles was in some respects as a study of character, it was less in harmony with the whole atmosphere of the piece than is Mr. James's more discreetly touched performance of the same part. That there are certain crudities in the design and execution of the play is undeniable, and this is notably the case in the second act, when the appearance of Eccles and Sam Gerridge, who have come back in a Hansom cab with D'Alroy's servant, who was sent to fetch Polly Eccles, but thought that Eccles and Sam would do as well, is manifestly a *ficelle*, and a somewhat awkward one. But the awkwardness is now far less apparent than it has been on former occasions; and this is, no doubt, largely due to the manner in which the situation is treated by Mrs. Stirling as the Marquise, Mr. James as Eccles, and Mr. Brookfield as Sam Gerridge. The artificiality of the position is, in fact, concealed as much as possible by the art of the stage-management and the performers. So in the third act—which is said to be the longest act ever played on the modern stage, but which seems not a minute too long as it is now given—the dignity of Mrs. Stirling, the full, but artistically subdued, humour of Mr. James, and the complete naturalness of Mr. Brookfield increase the effect of scenes which have been known to lose something by over-accentuation. In Mrs. Stirling's hands the Marquise becomes here, as through the play, for the first time a living and plausible personage—a personage who, in spite of her affectations, is always dignified and well-bred; whose quotations from Froissart become an amiable eccentricity, instead of an intolerable bore; and whose haughty rebuke to Esther carries its own justification with it.

Mrs. Stirling's performance of this part is a curiously instructive answer to the allegations sometimes made that the Robertson comedies demand and create a narrow style of acting. Mrs. Stirling has, if any actress has, the large style, and she is the only actress who has made of the Marquise de St. Maur the character which it may be presumed the author intended, since for the first time the part seems possible and not unattractive. Mr. James, also for the first time, to use a hackneyed but convenient phrase, brings Eccles "into the picture." The tipsiness, the half-conscious hypocrisy, the meanness, the swagger of the man, are all duly indicated, but are not marked too strongly. Much is made of the smoking business in the third act, but not too much. The sketch, or picture, of character is true, but it is not obtrusive, and is as little repulsive as is consistent with the writing of the part. Since Mr. James's excellent performance in one of the worst-constructed plays of modern times, *The Guv'nor*, he has not been seen in any part in which his own individuality has been merged so completely and to such good effect. Mr. Brookfield's acting of Sam Gerridge is distinguished, as might have been expected from this actor's former performances and notably from that of Krux, in *School*,

by freedom from conventionality, and by a careful construction, by means of many small touches, of the character as it has appeared to the actor thinking it out for himself. Mr. Brookfield manages somehow, by an artful arrangement of costume—it may be noted that Gerridge appears for the first time in a possible costume in the second act—to disguise his height; and his bearing is throughout that of a workman who has the habit of lounging and sulking merely because the habit is to him the only possible expression of feelings which he himself scarcely understands. His outburst of gaiety is as mechanical as his surliness; and the actor is right in making it absolutely sudden, both in its beginning and its end. This, too, is the case with the little bit of pathos, which is capitally given. Various tricks, such as that of attracting the attention of other persons by a peculiar whistle, are effective and true.

Of other new comers to the cast of the play—Miss Gerard and Mr. Conway, as Esther Eccles and D'Alroy—it may be said that, if they have less claim to praise, they work well for the general effect. Miss Gerard's performance suffers, one would say, from that excess of sensibility against which Diderot protested in his *Paradoxe sur le Comédien*. It is obvious that the actress has, as far as she is concerned, entered into the part; but unluckily she does not transmit her own emotions to the spectators. Perhaps this may be partly due to the fact that the player tries to put more into the part than it will readily bear. The part is in fact pathetic, not tragic, and between the two there is a wide difference, which Miss Gerard does not seem to fully appreciate, but as to which she might learn something from studying Mrs. Bancroft's acting as Polly, the light touch of which, directed alternately to tears and laughter, is in the true spirit of pathetic comedy. Of Mr. Bancroft's Hawtree we have often had occasion to speak in terms of praise, and to that praise we need only add that practice has increased the ease of an almost faultless performance. It has the merit, which Mr. Conway's pleasing rendering of D'Alroy altogether misses, of being a distinct impersonation, a complete transformation of the actor into a character foreign to those with which his name is generally associated. Compare it, for instance, with Sir Frederick Blount, in *Money*. Both are fops, and Mr. Bancroft has played other parts in somewhat the manner of Blount, but Hawtree is unique. Mr. Conway's D'Alroy is, as we have said, pleasing, but it is not an impersonation. It is just such a young man as Mr. Conway has represented in play after play; it is, in fact, Mr. Conway speaking the words and going through the actions set down for him with more or less grace and intelligence. Those who remember Mr. Younge, and we may add Mr. Clayton, in the part will know that it admits of very much more meaning being put into it. Mr. Conway's fault is, in fact, the very opposite of Miss Gerard's. He sees too little in his part, while she sees too much in hers. A word of praise is due to Mr. Vernon's effective delivery of the few words assigned to him in a very interesting representation.

Caste is preceded by the old-fashioned little piece, *The Little Sentinel*, which has been sensibly modified in the way of removing certain absurdities which were inherent in the school to which it originally belonged, and which have been stereotyped by Thackeray in *A Night's Pleasure*. In this it will be remembered that the unhappy victim of young Augustus Jones witnessed a "comedy of English life," in which "Bob, like a fashionable young dog of the aristocracy (the character was played by Bulger, a meritorious man, but very stout, and nearly fifty years of age), was dressed in a rhubarb-coloured body-coat with brass buttons, a couple of underwaistcoats, a blue satin stock with a paste brooch in it, and an eighteenpenny cane, which he never let out of his hand, and with which he poked fun at everybody." So in *The Little Sentinel*, according to the old stage directions, Captain Courtington appears in uniform, and has whiskers and a method of speech which are alike impossible; and the piece is full of similar blunders. All this has, as a matter of course, been changed; and it only remains to wonder if it would not have been more wise to provide an absolutely new piece for Miss Gwynne, Miss Wade, Mr. Elliot, Mr. Smedley, and Mr. Everill, all of whom play with liveliness and effect in *The Little Sentinel*.

At "Toole's Theatre" a pleasant surprise is now furnished for those playgoers who have not yet seen *Dot*, and who may hitherto have entertained some doubt as to Mr. Toole's powers of acting in the line of pathos. Any such doubt cannot but be removed by his performance of Caleb Plummer, a part which is nothing if not pathetic, and which, with Mr. Toole in it, is much indeed. The actor, made up in skilful resemblance of Leech's illustrations of Caleb Plummer in *The Cricket on the Hearth*, imparts a reality, a conviction to the character which cannot but be surprising to those who have known him only or chiefly as a player of parts purely or mostly comic. Comedy is not wanting in the impersonation, but it is the comedy with which pathos is largely intermingled, and which calls forth mixed emotions. Mr. Toole throughout touches the right chords, enlisting sympathy now for Caleb's half-humorous, half-regretful delight in his stratagems, now for his just anger against Tackleton, and again for his purely pathetic confession, followed by wild delight at his son's return. The art is fine throughout, but perhaps never finer than in Caleb's chiming in with the "Not yet, John," of the others just before the end of the piece. This, to use a phrase which once moved *The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table* to a fierce indignation, "tells the whole story." It conveys a full sense of Caleb's physical weakness, and of the mental overthrow produced for the moment by

unexpected joy. The words are uttered half-mechanically, feebly; while the very fact and method of their utterance indicates that Caleb feels that his bondage is over. Mr. Billington, as John Peerybingle, plays with his accustomed and welcome breadth and feeling, and Mr. E. D. Ward gives a lively and well-bred rendering of the returned son, both in his disguise and in his own character.

Mr. Guffin's Elopement, which follows *Dot*, goes, if possible, better than ever. Mr. E. D. Ward exhibits a singular versatility, and some singular accomplishments, in the part of the man who frightens Guffin out of his wits. Mr. Ward's versatility is indeed not less remarkable in its way than that shown by Mr. Toole, who, having moved his audience to tears in *Dot*, moves them to laughter as Mr. Guffin, and leaves them consumed with a desire to know what it can possibly have been that he saw in room number nine when he lost his way in a strange hotel. Mr. Toole's song and Mr. Toole's duet with Mr. Ward might alone make the success of a piece in which it is pleasant to recognize the type of the French *vaudeville* dear to Scribe and too long neglected in France as in England, where, however, an exceptional company, such as Mr. Toole has, is needed to do it justice. In France, in days not so very long gone by, most actors could get through a half-singing, half-speaking part creditably. In England the art of *vaudeville* acting has been confined to the clever company which still bears the names of Mr. and Mrs. German Reed until Mr. Toole took it up.

Mr. Toole and his company have shown more art in the transplanting of *vaudeville* than have the managers for the time being of Her Majesty's Theatre in the transplanting of *féerie*. *The Yellow Dwarf* appears to have been originally designed as a *féerie* on the Châtelet model, and to have been prematurely produced. Many changes for the better have been made since its first production. Elements of offence have been removed, and it has been turned into a pantomime by the addition of a harlequinade. Such an addition does not make a real pantomime; but real pantomime, save for such pantomimists as Mr. Martinetti, is dead, and nothing but an intelligent management securing the aid of true pantomime artists can revive it. *The Yellow Dwarf* falls somewhat between two stools. It is not a *féerie*; it wants the force and wit of those pieces to which Lesueur to some extent sacrificed his talent. It is not a pantomime, for there is no connexion between the opening and the harlequinade, and the harlequinade is, with all the cleverness of the Messrs. Hulme who as clown and pantaloons do musical and other business which would be yet more admirable on the part of circus clowns, a thing perfunctorily arranged. But it is the means of introducing a striking "Dolls' Quadrille," done by Mlle. Rosa and others, a very graceful and attractive performance by Mlle. Aenea, the "flying fairy," and two small elephants who do marvels in the way of intelligence, obedience, and skill. Many a performing elephant we have seen, "but never aught like this." There is an air of simple pride about them which is most engaging, and which is thoroughly justified by the extraordinary precision and intelligence with which they go through their parts. One might say that one of them is perhaps more brilliant than the other; but it would be an evil deed to stir up ill feeling between two performers who deserve the highest praise. Amongst the company engaged in the opening, Miss Coveney, Mr. Etienne Girardot, and the Messrs. Hulme deserve special praise. Mr. Girardot's intensely sincere interpretation of his part promises indeed remarkably well.

Comrades at the Court Theatre is now preceded by a pretty trifle, called *The Happy Return*, which is written by Mr. Arthur Law, and which gives Mr. Arthur Cecil an opportunity for displaying his remarkable power in what may be termed domestic pathos. Those who remember his *Tourbillon* will be glad to see Mr. Cecil once more in a part in which his capacity for touching the hearts of his audience finds exercise, and those who have only seen the actor in "character" parts will be at once surprised and delighted by his present performance of Captain Hardy. Mr. Cecil was particularly happy in the passage where he affects, or tries to affect, to treat the business which is wringing his heart as a practical joke. Miss Ruth Francis plays with real feeling and taste as Grace Fielding, and Mr. D. G. Boucicault acts with spirit as young Hardy.

REVIEWS.

SAMUEL RICHARDSON.*

IT is high time that due honour should be done to one of the most famous of English novelists, when sumptuous editions are appearing of so many of his modern followers in the field of fiction. The present volumes do not attempt to rival the external grandeur of some of the recent *éditions de luxe*, but they are handsome books for the library, and do not err to the same degree in being too bulky for comfortable reading, although it might be wished that they had been produced with more reference to the hand of the reader than to the library shelf. The reprints of Miss Austen's and other novels by Messrs. Bentley & Co. are models of what can be done in combining sufficient bibliographic importance with a convenient size and weight of volume.

* *The Works of Samuel Richardson*. With a Prefatory Chapter of Biographical Criticism by Leslie Stephen. 12 vols. Vols. I. and II. *Pamela*. London: H. Sotheran & Co.

The last complete publication of Richardson's novels is that contained in Ballantyne's *Novelist's Library*, published in 1824 with prefaces by Sir Walter Scott, and there had been in 1811 a previous edition of them. Of *Pamela* singly, the last edition was in 1801, and of *Clarissa* and *Grandison* in 1820. Abridgments of all three in a popular form have appeared within the last ten years. This may serve to show that, if not much actually read, there has never ceased to be a certain demand for Richardson, and indeed it would have been very strange if the works of so great a writer had become utterly neglected and forgotten. If he owed his first vast popularity to the circumstance of there being at the time so little generally readable fiction, he may also be supposed to have afterwards lost it through the excessive multiplication of such literature. But it must not be forgotten that Richardson was not only the author of his three great novels, but that he created a new kind of writing, and addressed a new reading public. The lengthy and tedious romances of Scuderi and Calprenède were still in vogue; and Mrs. Shirley in *Grandison* speaks of the mischief done by them in exciting the imagination of young girls and making them averse to sober and sensible matches. But the class of readers to whom *Pamela* was addressed can have known nothing of their dangerous delights, and for them a new world of reading was opened. That this should have been done by a well-to-do man of business, long past middle life, and, in the first instance, on a trade order given by publishers, is indeed a most remarkable fact in the history of literature. That the discovery of Richardson's power made in the first part of *Pamela* should have been followed up by the production of *Clarissa* and *Grandison* is equally striking. Yet, on looking into the history of the man and his antecedents, matters appear in addition to his own genius and knowledge of human nature in explanation of these phenomena. Richardson's father—called a joiner, but more properly speaking something of an architect or house decorator—had been a person of some small note; and, but for reduced pecuniary circumstances, his son would have been educated for the ministry of the Church of England. He had been concerned in politics with Monmouth and Shaftesbury, and seems to have attracted sufficient observation to make it prudent for him to leave London on the collapse of their cause. Then there was, as in the case of Sir Walter Scott, the early love of reading and storytelling, and a precocious fondness for letter-writing, fostered by assisting young women in their correspondence with their sweethearts. Literary habits were, of course, further developed by employment as a printer, and by doing some hack work for the booksellers. Nor can Richardson's acquaintance with the manners of the class who chiefly figure in his last two novels have been so little founded on personal intercourse as is frequently assumed.

Pamela was written to order with a view to supplying a manual of morality and for the conduct of life to young persons in the position of the heroine. The moral, however, is a questionable one. The practical advice contained in it, to a good-looking young woman in the service of a libertine master, is this—repel outrageous advances but keep up a certain amount of encouragement, and you will become the lawful wife instead of being the mistress of your intending seducer. Nevertheless, at the time the book was accepted as offering a model of virtue for imitation. It had been written in three months, and it went through five editions in one year. It incurred the fate of many works of similar popularity, and was followed by an unauthorized continuation; and this induced Richardson himself to add a second part, called *Pamela in High Life*, which, as might be expected, was very inferior to the first part, all the interest being gone. *Pamela* appeared in 1739, and was succeeded by *Clarissa* at an interval of eight years. The great and immediate success of the old printer's second novel is perhaps without a parallel in the history of literature. In England it was at once raised to the highest pinnacle of reputation. Johnson estimated the morality of people according as they liked or disliked *Clarissa*. It was "the first book in the world for the knowledge it displayed of the human heart." And it must be remembered that with all this Johnson had no strong personal love for Richardson. Macaulay knew *Clarissa* by heart, and the copy he took out with him to India once set the Governor-General and all the great officials at Simla with their wives in a passion of uncontrollable excitement. Mackintosh thought it the finest work of fiction written in any language. On the Continent it was from the beginning, and always since has been, held in almost frantic admiration. It was raved about and imitated by Rousseau in his *Nouvelle Héloïse*. Diderot pronounced an *éloge* upon Richardson at his death, in which he called him divine, and said that if he had to sell all his books, he would retain those by the author of *Clarissa*, as worthy to be placed on the same shelf with Moses, Homer, Euripides, and Sophocles. Long afterwards it was called by Alfred de Musset "*le premier roman du monde*." Yet it was only in an abridged version by the Abbé de Prévost, the author of *Manon Lescaut*, that the French became acquainted with *Clarissa*, and Rousseau himself entertained the intention of abridging it still further—a design which was in recent times carried out by Jules Janin. It is easy to understand that the prolixity of Richardson's method of writing must have been more intolerable in a translation than in the original; and even the really higher appreciation of his merits as an artist which prevailed among the French might well fail to reconcile them to it. It is more difficult to understand how the book produced the astonishing effect it did when read in a shortened form. The English abridgment of

Clarissa, edited by the late Mr. Dallas and published a few years ago, met with scant recognition; and to some who knew the book in its integrity the reading of this abridgment helped to explain and justify Richardson's treatment of the subject at such inordinate length. Such an edifice as that planned and completed by him in *Clarissa* requires to have its foundations sunk deep, and to be built up with great solidity and the most careful attention to every detail. It could not be rapidly run up; and the reader who wishes to follow the work of the author must be content to do so with equal care and abstinence from undue haste. It would be as unreasonable to expect to take in, and understand with the head and feel in the heart, this wonderful performance without much toil and even painful diligence, as it would be to suppose that the vast prospect from the summit of Mont Blanc could be enjoyed after an easy ascent in a lift as much as it would be after a long and laborious climb. About the main characters in *Clarissa* there has always been some controversy. Mr. Leslie Stephen is in company with many others when he complains that the character of Lovelace is impossible and unnatural. These gentlemen remind one of the eminent French critic already named when he expostulated with the author of *Henry V.* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor* on his erroneous treatment of a certain fat knight, "*Ah! Vill Shakespeare, Vill Shakespeare, tu as gâté mon Falstaff!*" What kind of a substitute, it may be wondered, would have been produced from Jules Janin's buck-basket; and what sort of a Lovelace would Richardson's would-be improvers like to have? Possibly no one exactly like Lovelace ever did exist. Neither did any such semi-human monster as Caliban; but, Shakespeare having created the one and Richardson the other, both are made to act as such creations must have acted according to the laws of their being. The character of Lovelace is evolved with consummate knowledge of human nature, and is the most admirable of all Richardson's personages for the skill and audacity displayed in it. The opportunities for actually coming across such a man, with all his wicked charm, his wilfulness, his ability, and his powerful nature, must have been far more frequent in Richardson's time than they are now. Instances of enormous profligacy and libertinism, combined with agreeable manners, must have been well known to him. The names and exploits of Rochester and Sedley were of recent memory in his youth. The infamous Chartres was receiving the lash of Pope's satire in the days of his manhood. Only a few years after his death a peer of the realm was tried for the same crime, which was avenged by Colonel Morden's sword. With the strangely erratic Duke of Wharton Richardson was himself personally acquainted, and had printed for him the *True Briton* at one period of his career.

The improbability of *Clarissa*'s being unable to escape from the cruel and crafty toils of Lovelace has always been a matter for comment. Little is in general to be learned of the manners and customs of the period from Richardson's novels, whose interest in no important degree depends upon them, but solely on their plot, characters, and profound acquaintance with human nature—that is to say, with what given persons would say or do under given circumstances. But the absolute power of the elders of a family in those days does play a considerable part in *Clarissa*, and it explains the necessity of her escape from their tyranny, and the impossibility of returning to her home. This authority never had any legal sanction in England, but it is still a recognized portion of the law of the land in France, where the *conseil de famille* must on certain occasions be consulted, and where its decisions resemble those of a regularly constituted tribunal. But why did *Clarissa* not seek refuge elsewhere from the perilous protection of Lovelace when free to do so? The best answer to this must always be, that she had loved him, and still hoped to be able to love him again, and through him to escape from the persecutions of her own family. Certainly she had not, like Amy Robsart, in *Kenilworth*, partaken of the manna of St. Nicholas; she was not under the physical influence of a drug intended to produce such a state of temper as would keep a bird from flying out of its cage even if the door were left open; but she was under the spell of a moral fascination and a malignant concatenation of circumstances which were too potent for her nature to resist. What Sir Walter Scott felicitously called the "perverted Quixotry" of Lovelace must have added enormously to his power of entrancing a woman with the hope of fixing the man who had vowed that he never would be fixed; and in estimating the lofty standard of the book it may be remembered in what high regard Scott held it, but that it was one which Byron said he could not read. On the high comedy which mingles with the profound pathos of *Clarissa* there is also much to be said. Richardson was as much at home with Anna Howe as with her divine friend, and with all the rest of the very varied characters of the book. But we must pass on to his third great work.

If *Clarissa* be the *Iliad*, then will *Grandison* be well entitled to be called the *Odysey*, of Richardson's creation. It is a work of prodigious art. The construction of the character of Grandison, indeed, in some senses exceeds in conscious and defiant intrepidity the conception of Lovelace. As *Pamela* was to be a handbook of morality for the order to which its heroine belonged, so the two later works were written for the improvement of the upper classes. In *Clarissa* it was the tyranny of families and the libertinism of the age against which the moral of the story was directed. In *Grandison* the vices of irreligion, duelling, and gambling were to be exposed, and it was to be shown how a gentleman of good birth and fortune, who wore the finest clothes and had

the most polished manners, could shine without yielding to them. Sir Charles Grandison was to be a male *Pamela*; and, just as the one is upheld in innocence, and allowed to marry her master, forgiving him and the instruments of his iniquity without forfeiting respect, so the powers of self-control, the wonderful courage, and the masterly use of his sword with which Sir Charles is invested, are forced upon the reader's acceptance to account for his being able to maintain his station as a man of honour without fighting duels or giving way to the fashionable vices of his age. He never forfeits an advantage by losing his temper; and it is known that, if he chose to cross swords in the ring, he was sure to pink his man. Richardson had also to combat the feeling of satiety and even dislike which is provoked by the exhibition of a character of such absolute perfection. The *sum pius Aeneas* is not put into his own mouth, but his praises resound all around him. He does not even affect some harmless weakness or vanity to draw off animadversion from the serious parts of his character and conduct. He is a good son to a bad father; he discards an easy-going but pleasure-seeking governor, and applies himself to the reformation of an uncle, persuading him to marry to his own loss. He can do everything well—fence, ride, play, and dance. All the women are in love with him. He devotes himself to the practice of generosity and virtue. This is somewhat overwhelming; but Richardson triumphs over the difficulties of his own creation. The book is full of interesting characters, if not of incident; and those who have learned to read *Clarissa* ought to go further and also become acquainted with Richardson's latest work. For this, of course, time and patience must be provided. With all his admiration Johnson could say, "If you were to read Richardson for the story, your impatience would be so much fretted that you would hang yourself (and that sad fate is not to be desired for any one). But you must read him for the sentiment." If his own countryman could say this, it is not surprising that D'Alembert should have written:—"La Nature est bonne à imiter, mais non pas jusqu'à l'ennui." Nevertheless Richardson is amazingly well worth reading, and should be read. Time cannot be found for this as easily as a certain married gentleman is said to have found time to learn two or three languages, by using the intervals during which his wife kept him waiting and which otherwise would have been wasted. It would be better to leave off reading the newspapers, or the new novels, until these older ones have been read, and to remember what Rogers once said to a lady who pestered him for his opinion on some of the trash of the day. He said he had not read it. "What, then, do you do, Mr. Rogers?" "Why, when a new book comes out, I make it my business to read an old one." Acting on this principle, and recollecting that new novels now appear at the rate of one a day, there need be no difficulty in finding the occasion for reading even Richardson's voluminous productions.

COREA.*

"WHEN once we begin to move," said Prince Kung some years since to a foreign Minister at Peking, "we shall advance much faster than you expect." This prediction has unfortunately as yet failed of fulfilment, but were the same prophecy applied to Corea, it would be fully justified by the leaps and bounds by which that country has advanced within the last few years. Even as lately as 1877 so rigidly were all foreigners, not excepting the subjects of the sovereign State of China, excluded from the country, that, at the request of the King, an Imperial edict was published in the *Peking Gazette*, in which it was decreed that death by summary execution should be the penalty of any act of trespass beyond the river boundary by any subject of China. And now not only are Chinese and Japanese admitted by treaties into the country, but the subjects of European Powers enjoy the privilege of building their Hongks and Go-downs at certain ports, and of exchanging Manchester goods for whatever produce they may be able to extract from a somewhat sterile soil.

Corea has thus stepped out of the isolation which she shared with Tibet alone of all the nations of the world who pretend to any degree of civilization. Had the geographical position of these two countries been similar, had Corea been separated from her northern neighbour by lofty ranges of mountain and vast stretches of desert, and from all the rest of the world by scarcely traversable mountain barriers, her self-imposed seclusion might have remained intact. But with Russia pressing down on her northern frontier, and with three sides washed by the sea, the power of Corea to maintain her isolation plainly depended on the forbearance of the European Powers. On the principle of *omne ignotum pro magnifico*, the supposed wealth of Corea has for many years attracted the attention of strangers; but with sturdy courage the white-coated inhabitants of the peninsula have successfully defended their shores against the inroads of Western foreigners. The first of these attempts was the result of a bitter persecution which broke out in 1866 against the Roman Catholic missionaries and their converts. The news of the murder of Bishop Bernaux and three of his colleagues was brought to Peking by M. Ridel, who, after having endured incredible hardships, succeeded in eluding the vigilance of the Corean detectives and in making his escape to the less inhospitable shores of China. To punish the perpetrators of this outrage the French

* Corea; the Hermit Nation. By William Elliot Griffis. London: Allen & Co. 1882.

Minister despatched a force under Admiral Roze to Corea. With that habitual contempt for Asiatic enemies which characterizes European commanders, Admiral Roze undertook the conquest of a kingdom with six hundred soldiers. The result was such as might have been expected. In the various engagements after landing the French lost nearly a sixth of the force in killed and wounded, and the remainder, hopeless of victory, beat a precipitate retreat to the coast. During the interval between the murder of Bishop Berneux and the landing of the French force a more peaceful, but an even more disastrous, attempt was made to gain a footing in Corea. The *General Sherman*, an American vessel, was sent thither from the China coast with a cargo of wares which were considered likely to suit the Corean markets. Subsequent reports place it beyond doubt that she reached the Ta-tung river in safety, but nothing that can be confidently relied upon has since ever come to light of either the vessel or her ill-fated crew. Undeterred by the miserable failures of these two expeditions, a German trader named Oppert determined in the following year to attempt a landing on the peninsula. The object of this invasion was said to have been to secure the body of one of the deceased kings—a rumour which found some confirmation in an account of the expedition subsequently published by Oppert, in which he recounted his efforts to gain access to the royal mausoleum. No regret need be wasted on the failure of Mr. Oppert's designs. Three years later Mr. Low, the American Minister at Peking, deemed it advisable to pay a visit in force to the Corean capital to point out to the Government the crime which had been committed in the destruction of the *General Sherman*, and to urge the conclusion of a treaty. But the Coreans were as deaf to his remonstrances as to his entreaties, and, moreover, fired upon his boats as they ascended the river leading to Seoul. Being prepared for this contingency, the Americans attacked in their turn and took the offending fort. But finding that this step had brought them no nearer to the results they desired to obtain, they withdrew from the country, thus again leaving Corean soil free from the footprints of a foreigner.

By the irony of fate it was destined that the entrance of Europeans into Corea was to be effected by the nation which but a few years ago was distinguished by as bitter a hatred for foreigners as ever rankled in the Corean mind. The possession of a powerful fleet and a well-disciplined army enabled the Japanese in 1876 to send so imposing a force to demand compensation for the murder of some Japanese sailors, that the Coreans, after having had resort to the usual evasions common to Oriental diplomacy, yielded to circumstances, and agreed not only to send an embassy to Tokio to apologize for the murders, but to contract a treaty with the invaders. Anxious to show that they could establish commercial ports on the soil of an unwilling nation as well as any European Power, the Japanese founded settlements at Fusan and Won-an, and before long rows of foreign-looking Hongs, connected by telephones and presided over by consuls, marked the triumph of Japanese diplomacy. Thus was inserted the thin end of the wedge which was driven home last year, when, Commodore Shufeldt and Admiral Wiles leading the way, commercial treaties were concluded between Corea and America, England, Germany, France, and, curiously enough, China also.

Since so much trouble has been expended in throwing open the Corean market to European goods, it is worth while to inquire what are the physical features of the country, and by whom it is inhabited. On these points the work before us gives numerous details, and from the information which the author has acquired by a study of all the available authorities on the subject, he is able to lay before us a tolerably full account of the country, both past and present. Corea, then, is a peninsula extending southwards from Manchuria and the Russian Amoor territory to the neighbourhood of Japan—indeed, less than forty miles separate it from the Japanese islands of Tsushima. It contains an area of between eighty and ninety thousand square miles, and possesses a coast line of about seventeen hundred and forty miles. In extreme length it measures 540 miles, and it is 180 miles across in its widest part. A range of mountains “winds in and out ninety-nine times,” as the Coreans say, through the whole length of the peninsula on its eastern side, and gradually slopes away towards the west. It is on the western side, therefore, that the main centres of population and commerce are to be found. Seoul, the capital, is situated in the neighbourhood of the Han river, which empties itself into the Yellow Sea exactly opposite the Shan-tung peninsula, from which it is separated by about 180 miles. The climate in the northern portion of the kingdom is severe, ice holding the rivers bound for three months in the year; but in the south, where the sea breezes temper both the winter frosts and the summer heats, the climate is delightful. The presence of tigers, leopards, wild deer, and monkeys in large numbers is enough to prove that in at least a large portion of the country the cold cannot be severe.

In the first few chapters of his work Mr. Griffin gives an outline of the history of Corea from its first mention by Arabian writers in the ninth century down to the present time. As he has been compelled to go for his facts to the works of Chinese and Japanese historians, the account is necessarily fragmentary and not always trustworthy. These authorities confuse the tribes by whom the peninsula was originally populated in the most perplexing manner, and it will only be from fuller and more accurate records that we can expect to gain a thorough understanding of the ethnic relations existing between the different peoples who go under the names of Pê-tse Mahan, Pohai, Benran, &c. But one fact comes plainly out of the tangled mass of statements and misstatements,

and that is that from an early period there was introduced into Corea a large leaven of Chinese civilization by the advent of political refugees who, on the destruction of successive dynasties, fled across the Yellow Sea in search of an asylum from their enemies. With these men came a knowledge of the arts and sciences of China, and by them the kingdom was gradually moulded into a replica of their mother-country. To the untutored and unlettered Coreans was in this way made available the wisdom of Confucius and Mencius, followed at a later date by the religious tenets of Buddhism. No doubt among the Chinese immigrants and the more learned of the natives the knowledge of the Chinese written characters was preserved; but these were as caviare to the million, and were never in general use throughout the peninsula. Native historians believe that in the early part of the eighth century a syllabary was invented by a Minister named Chul-chong, which was composed of a certain number of selected portions of Chinese characters, to which fixed phonetic values were given, exactly on the model of the *kata-lana* writing of the Japanese. This syllabary is called *Nido*; but as no authenticated specimens of it have yet come to light, it may very possibly be that, as is held by many of the best Japanese scholars, it is but another name for the Japanese syllabary which they suggest may have been introduced into Corea during some of the many invasions of that country by its restless island neighbours.

But, be that as it may, the literature, at least, of Corea is borrowed, consisting entirely, or almost entirely, of translations from the Chinese. With this powerful lever, the Chinese element in the country had little difficulty in moulding the political and social institutions on its own pattern. Thus we find the government at the capital administered by six Boards on the model of the *Luh Pu* at Peking. The annual festivals, also, together with the marriage and other ceremonies, are almost identical with those observed in China, while the practice of combining in guilds and associations for the protection of trades is obviously derived from the same source. It was inevitable that a country so dependent for its vitality on China should fall under Chinese influence; and the claim which that Empire now makes to be considered its suzerain is unquestionably founded on the fealty to her which Corea has acknowledged for centuries. But, unfortunately, like the natives of Liu-kiu, the Coreans have at times been compelled by force of arms to offer allegiance also to Japan. Such ties have but a small binding force among Orientals. They become as chains of triple steel or as gossamer threads, as the circumstances of the hour decide. No direful results need therefore be anticipated from the controversy now being carried on between China and Japan as to the shadowy rights which each believes to be its own over the Government of Corea. A compromise will probably be effected, and the honour of both nations will be satisfied. Both politically and commercially, Corea is at the present moment an interesting subject, and we are only doing Mr. Griffin's volume justice when we say that it is the best existing account of this latest convert to the belief in the fellowship of nations.

LIFE OF BISHOP WILBERFORCE.—VOL. III.*

(Second Notice.)

IN 1867 the Church of England was more near than people imagined to a serious catastrophe, brought about by an exuberance of self-will in more than one direction and by a temporary paralysis of sober and sufficient will on the part of those who were the legitimate guardians of ecclesiastical peace and order. Up to three or four years previously to that date the improvement in church arrangements and in worship, which was an offshoot, chiefly springing from Cambridge, of the Tractarian movement, had, thanks to the tentative prudence of its leaders, continued to make measured, but sure, progress. But success bred incantation; and the doctrine took root of a personal duty on the part of individual clergymen to revive ritual the obligation of which, however defensible on historical or legal authority, had been dispensed with by the general acquiescence in disuse of the corporate body. This was startling doctrine to persons who could grasp the reach and possible developments of such a principle; while the reasons in themselves on which the legality of the unwonted ceremonial was asserted belonged to branches of study which were unknown, despised, or distrusted by the general run of mankind. To crown all, these men of progress gave a fictitious look of novelty to their enterprise by parading the terms Ritualism and Ritualist as their own exclusive possession. The result was a scare, which menaced an ugly reaction from the hitherto satisfactory, though chequered, growth of the artistic and ceremonial instinct within the Church of England.

The usage which excited the strongest adverse criticism was naturally the one which innovated most ostentatiously upon the old-fashioned look of the churches, and so the capital conflict was engaged over the Eucharistic dress. In October 1865 Bishop Wilberforce expressed his apprehension to Sir George Prevost that Bishop Tait meditated legislating upon ritual. That most unwise and really insignificant man, Lord Westmeath, had in the previous Session been making a disturbance on the question in the House of Lords, and later on that year Archbishop Longley consulted the other bishops as to issuing a joint Pastoral on Ritual. Bishop Wilberforce's answer was strongly against any such

* *Life of Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford and then of Winchester.* By his Son, Reginald G. Wilberforce. 3 vols. Vol. III. London: John Murray. 1882.

address, while laying down that, for such a document to be tolerable, it must fulfil certain really impossible conditions, one being absolute unanimity among the dignitaries who issued it. The emphasis of this suggestion rested on the marked divergence of opinion which a private discussion among the bishops a few months previously had brought out. The matter of the Pastoral came for debate before the collective episcopate on February 7 and 9, 1866, at which one opinion, at least, was delivered worthy of commemoration. Bishop Phillpotts, now in extreme old age, observed that, "if you try to enforce the rubric you will have a rebellion; try to alter it, and you will cause a shipwreck." On a division the address was carried by 13 votes to 8, including in the minority those of Bishop Thirlwall, Wilberforce, Jackson and Elliott, but was in face of such opposing influence dropped.

The question then slumbered in high regions for about a year; and on February 13, 1867, the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury gave their answer to an excellent Report on the Ritual question proceeding from a Committee of the Lower House, of which, though Mr. Wilberforce forgets to note it, the chairman was the present Bishop of Carlisle, then Dean of Ely. The gist of the answer was the sanction of the bishop of the diocese as the antecedent to alterations from long-sanctioned and usual ritual. This is followed by a letter from Bishop Wilberforce to Bishop Hamilton of Salisbury, dated March 6, 1867, clumsily introduced in the Life with no preceding explanation:—

After you left [the bishops' meeting] I used my utmost endeavours to check this suicidal step. But, alas! not only were York [Thomson], Durham [Raring], Carlisle [Waldgrave], Ripon [Bickersteth], Peterborough [Jeune] for it, but Ely [Harold Browne] and, above all, Canterbury [Longley] said they must support it if brought forward!!!

The Bishop then dwelt on the "terrible evil of the English Episcopate supporting Shaftesbury in such a step," giving obvious reasons for his fear. It here comes out that it was this inchoate Bill of the great Low Church Earl that had caused the flutter. The answer of the Bishops was, "Then if the Archbishop brought in such a Bill," to which, somewhat hastily as appears to us, the Bishop of Oxford on his own showing gave an answer which was taken to imply more acquiescence than he meant. Thereupon it was agreed that "Shaftesbury should be hounded off," and a Committee was appointed to draw the Bill. The same history is told still more vividly in a letter to Mr. Gladstone, which explains that Lord Shaftesbury's threatened Bill was "for making the 50th Canon the absolute and sole rule of the Church of England as to ornaments, dresses, &c.," or, in other words, to cut everything down to the surplice. Furthermore, the Bishop had heard that "Lord Russell and Walpole (!) [the Home Secretary, for the Conservatives were in office] have expressed their approval, and the Archbishop is going on."

It is hardly necessary in 1883 to point out, what ought to have been clear to the Episcopate of 1867, that such a Bill as Lord Shaftesbury proposed would have been one to put down the historical Church of England. The Bishop's influence was not long in prevailing with the Archbishop, who wrote to his brother of Oxford in the same month of March:—"Lord Derby informs me that the Cabinet are unanimously of opinion that any proceedings in regard to recent Ritualistic practices had better be taken by a Commission than through immediate legislation." From this date, of course, the formation of the Ritual Commission was only a matter of detail. The biography, with tantalizing brevity, calls attention to a notable instance of the irony of human events in the arrangements necessary to float the Ritual Commission. Bishop Wilberforce was anxious not only to include a subsequent reference to Convocation in the terms of the Commission, but to limit its scope to the Ornaments Rubric; while, as it came out in accordance with a statement of Lord Derby, it swept in not only the whole corpus of Rubrics, but also the Lectionary. What we desiderate is some detailed explanation of this transaction—who the men were, and what were the reasons which produced the extension of scope. On the surface Bishop Wilberforce's preference appeared the more safe and Conservative policy. As matters fell out it would have been just the contrary. A Commission of foremost men in Church and State turned loose on a cupboardful of vestures like a pack of hounds to whom something had been tossed to worry, could not have failed to justify the somewhat grotesque fact of its existence by drastic recommendations. But the consideration of the whole machinery of our public worship was a knot the untying of which was no contemptible task for any body of men, however distinguished, to assemble over, while the vestary question fell into its place as only a portion of a large and varied responsibility. So, as the efficient cause of the new Lectionary Act and the Shortened Services Act, the Ritual Commission more than justified its existence, although thirteen years have passed since its dissolution, and Ritualism as a system has in the meanwhile only been hustled, but not dissected, by Parliament. Mistaken as he may have been in this early advice, the Bishop mastered the incidents of the wider policy which was adopted as readily and completely as if it had been the fruit of his own suggestion. Deference was so far paid to the popular cry that the points so-called of Ritualism were taken in hand before the remaining Rubrics or the Lectionary.

If the Round Table of King Arthur was "the image of the mighty world," hardly less could be said of that horseshoe-table which Dean Stanley's picturesque and hospitable antiquarianism planted in the Jerusalem Chamber as the place of meeting for the Ritual Commission. A gathering more diversified in every attribute, except a common profession of membership of the Church of England, could hardly be found than the mixed multitude of

twenty-nine ecclesiastics and laymen who composed that body. Much learning marked some, that sort of information which does service for learning was the characteristic of others, and it would be charitable to infer that the reason of the presence of others was to complete a branch of their education which had been unluckily neglected. At the first or second meeting of the body a distinguished statesman rose and said that the Commission need not anticipate any tedious spell of sittings; they would only have to ascertain what were the peculiarities of the Ritualists. The Archbishop of Canterbury would then inform them what was the right practice, they would report accordingly, and the business would be over in two or three sittings. The reply that, apart from technical Ritualism, the variations which existed in the rendering of the Prayer-Book made any such summary process absolutely impossible, fell on unwilling ears as a grim surprise, and it required the successive evidence of witnesses picked from all parties in the Church to bring home to them how long and difficult was the task to which they had unwarily committed themselves.

The line which Bishop Wilberforce followed throughout the years during which the Commission continued its sittings was more to his credit, as it is abundantly clear from many hints dropped all through the biography, that for Ritual as a system based, like heraldry or the table of precedence or the procedure of Parliament and law courts, on fixed rules which, irrespectively of their real value, had antecedent reasons of their own to show for their niceties, he had but little sympathy, or rather much inability to grasp the fact. His reverential feelings led him to honour God with the best of art, and he loved beauty for its own sake; so he appreciated noble buildings, solemn music, rich windows, and so on. But his æstheticism was that of a landscape-painter, and not of a ceremonialist. No doubt this deficiency led him into mistakes when he came down heavily on the wrong thing, and perhaps let pass something worthy of criticism. But, on the other hand, when disposed to let down some Ritualist in an easy man-of-the-world way, he was not hampered by distinctions which would have troubled a theologian of more accurate knowledge. On the whole, then, we believe that it was better both for them and for himself that he did not thoroughly understand the subject.

Those who have studied the Blue-books of the Commission will have observed how many attempts were made in its earlier days to devise some vestimentary compromise. Limitation of colour, limitation of hours, limitation to district churches or proprietary chapels were successively attempted and always defeated, though upon one or two occasions by very narrow majorities. It was no secret to those behind the scene that the strongest operative influence against any concession was Archbishop Longley's; for, generally tolerant and conciliatory as he was, he had a strong personal antipathy to the Eucharistic dress, which may indeed go far to account for the readiness which he showed to walk into Lord Shaftesbury's snare. At last the first Report was reached, and the good management of the pacific minority secured the adoption of a conclusion in favour not of prohibiting, but only of restraining, the vestments, which was signed by the entire Commission, though not without explanatory notes. To be sure, the Report for which that section of the Commission—and particularly Bishop Wilberforce—were primarily responsible gave life to the ill-omened trio of "aggrieved parishioners" who have since postured in so much malicious folly. But in themselves they were intended to be a substitute for the single informer—who need not be a parishioner at all—of the Church Discipline Act, and their field of action was intended to be confined to the one case of vestments. To quote the first Report of the Ritual Commission—wise or unwise as it may have been—as any excuse for the Public Worship Regulation Act is to confound history. The biography is brief about the second Report of the Commission, touching lights and incense, but the notice is adequate. The abstentions which marked the signatures deprived it of all moral value; and after it the Commission turned to the less glittering task of revising, slowly and carefully, the rubrics of the Prayer-Book one by one, as well as of composing the new Lectionary. Of the former work, except in the Shortened Services Act, no formal result has been netted. But, as a literary contribution to the understanding and working of the Prayer-Book, the long labour has not been thrown away. Mr. Wilberforce has forgotten to record that after the death of Archbishop Longley, and on that long illness of Archbishop Tait which threatened to cut his archiepiscopate prematurely short, Bishop Wilberforce, then of Winchester, became chairman of the Commission, and as such signed the final Report.

We are disappointed at Mr. Wilberforce's silence about his father's line in that most conspicuous stage of the Ritual struggle, the Purchas Judgment. No more emphatic tribute to the success of Bishop Wilberforce's ecclesiastical policy can be found than the fact that the change of episcopal front which that wretched attempt at legislation, the Public Worship Regulation Act, signified was the immediate sequel of his death. In less than ten years the chief author of the Act concluded a career which was but for this mistake one of distinguished usefulness, by a noble act of atonement, and thereby more than vindicated the prescience of his relation and fellow-prelate. Viewed in this aspect, the third volume of the Life of Bishop Wilberforce has appeared at an opportune moment, and persons will hereafter turn with interest to the revelations which it contains of his connexion with the Ritual and other ecclesiastical and spiritual controversies after the novelty, and therefore the value, has passed from the random jottings about the political turpitude of Palmerston or Disraeli.

THE IMPERIAL DICTIONARY.—VOLS. III. & IV.*

WE may begin our notice of these two volumes, which complete the *Imperial Dictionary*, by offering our congratulations to the editor and the publishers. The promise of the first volume has been kept throughout; and the whole, as completed, is a monument of patience, industry, and good work. From beginning to end it has received the same thorough and conscientious care; it is copious; it is trustworthy; it is beautifully illustrated; and it is admirably printed on good paper. The last volume is enriched with a preface in which the editor speaks at some length of the methods employed and the principles on which he has worked. Thus, he was anxious that the work should include all the latest scientific and technological words; that it should adequately fulfil the literary functions of a dictionary by registering, defining, and explaining the various meanings attached to words by writers new or old, by explaining idiomatic phrases, by distinguishing obsolete from current usages, by indicating words which are rare, poetical, colloquial, or local, and by the discrimination of synonyms. Next, the dictionary was to preserve its encyclopædic character—that is to say, under the name of steam-engine, for instance, an account of the principle, construction, and action of the steam-engine was to be given; this expansion of the ordinary dictionary necessitates a great many explanatory woodcuts. And, lastly, the etymological department was to include all the most recent work of philologists. As regards the history of the dictionary of which this is the new edition, we learn that the first edition of Ogilvie's *Imperial Dictionary* was published between January 1847 and January 1850. It was based on the edition of Webster which was published in 1841. The alterations and improvements introduced by Dr. Ogilvie into the American work included, besides the addition of 20,000 entries, the employment of those pictorial illustrations which form so useful and characteristic a feature of the Dictionary. He also attempted to give the work an encyclopædic character. For instance, in Webster, under the word *spider* (whose derivation he does not know) we find a short account in four lines; but in the *Imperial*, where the derivation is given, there is half a column of scientific description. As regards the introduction of woodcuts, this was not altogether a new idea. So early as 1726 the well-known dictionary of Nathan Bailey contained woodcuts of heraldic and mathematical terms; the general application of the principle, however, was new; and so greatly was it appreciated that the next American edition of Webster made haste to follow the example and to copy the illustrations which had already appeared in the *Imperial*.

It would appear that a new edition of a dictionary, as of an encyclopædia, should appear once in every generation. During the last thirty years, for instance, an immense advance has been made in the scientific study of the English language; many doubtful and contested etymologies have been conclusively settled; many early uses of words have been rescued; and a great deal of solid work has been done by philologists, collectors of provincial words, and others, useful to the maker of a dictionary. In addition to this, the development of science in every branch has led to the introduction of a vast number of new words and new uses, inasmuch that whereas Dr. Ogilvie thirty years ago could only add 20,000 words to Webster, Mr. Annandale has added 30,000 to Dr. Ogilvie. But of these some are due to the introduction of Scotch words, American words, and such foreign words as are in frequent use in English books. Some slang words are also found in the new edition.

It is difficult to say where a line must be drawn in a dictionary intended for general use, and the editor can only act on his own judgment. Thus Mr. Annandale has very wisely, we think, added the Scotch words found in Burns and Scott, and has, perhaps not so wisely, included the vocabulary of Chaucer. For, to begin with, Chaucer is only read by students who do not expect the *Imperial Dictionary* to help them; and one cannot help asking why, if Chaucer is included, Gower, Piers Plowman, Occleve, Barclay, Lydgate, Skelton, and others are not also included? It seems as if it would have been simpler, for instance, to begin somewhere about the middle of the sixteenth century—that is to say, practically, with Shakspeare and his contemporaries. In a modern general dictionary, too, the obsolete words of Chaucer strike the eye oddly, and seem a little out of place. Perhaps, however, Mr. Annandale has reasons for admitting Chaucer which he has not thought proper to tell us. Altogether, the number of words in the new Dictionary amounts to 130,000—a very respectable number indeed, particularly when we remember that it has been asserted that the ordinary rustic gets along with the use of from three to five hundred words; these express all his wants, if not all his ideas, some of which have probably to go unexpressed and so perish with him and are lost to the world. One wonders how many words go to make up the vocabulary of the ordinary educated Englishman. Most of these words are, of course, derived and connected. Thus, opening the book at random, we find on one page fifty-three entries, of which twenty belong to one word, eleven to another. A great amount of space also is taken up with the words beginning with *in* and *un*. Such words as *unfair*, *unfeeling*, *unfaithful*, for instance, which are merely contraries and opposites, go to swell out a dictionary, and are very properly entered in their place; but they are not independent words, and ought not to be numbered as

forming part of the words which really compose the language. At the end of the fourth volume we have a supplement containing words omitted in the Dictionary. This supplement may be regarded as an illustration of the care with which the work has been carried out. It contains, besides a great number of purely scientific words, a quantity of obscure ecclesiastical words, other senses in which words already entered have been used, ethnological words, and medical words. It is a highly instructive supplement, and contains an immense body of instruction; one may learn from it, for instance, the true nature of that strange disease of modern times, aphasia, and that it has a cousin, not quite so bad, named aphemia; the newly-revived method of storing grain called ensilage is explained; the most recent information about Accadian and the Accads is given; one may learn the rules of baccarat and loto; what is meant by boycotting and bull-dozing; the etymology of bric-à-brac; the meaning of such remarkable words as flap-doodle and pabouche; the origin and meaning of the Luddites, the Carders, and the Danites, or the exact meaning of the clôtüre. The ecclesiastical words are curious (was there ever a dictionary of purely ecclesiastical words?) but not particularly interesting to laymen; for instance, what is an ablegate? He is the officer charged with conveying his insignia of office to a newly-appointed cardinal. It is not stated whether he is a regular officer of the Church or only a special messenger. If there is a good salary attached to the post one might like to be an ablegate. What, again, is an "asterisk"—in the eyes of the Greek church, not those of a printer? How many are there who know what is the religion called Mazdean? The Salvation Army, again, is not forgotten; and one may learn what is meant by a Thomastite, and what by the Sheriat. Again, of new inventions there are the phonoscope and the Bessemer converter, both in the supplement; and of old machines there is the Sakieh of Egypt. Lastly, still keeping to the supplement, one may learn to distinguish between the Ghawazee and the Almei; and may make acquaintance, probably for the first time, with the dolly as applied to washing purposes, the common dottle, the gumby, the packing penny, and the knobkerrie, and may even be introduced to a Ladino.

After the supplement is given a vocabulary of Greek, Latin, and Scriptural names, with certain rules and directions for pronunciation. We observe that Mr. Annandale will have nothing to do with the new fashion of reading Latin. This list is not accompanied by any explanatory matter, and is therefore, we presume, intended only for reference and help in doubt and questions of pronunciation. The same may be said of the list of geographical names which follows. A third vocabulary will be found useful, and is, we believe, novel. It contains foreign words which form part of geographical names, with their meaning. Thus *giri* means mountains, and *Nilgiri* (Neigherry) means the blue mountains; *ard* is height, and *Ardgrass* is the green height; *hisar* is Turkish, and means castle, so that *Kara-hisar* means black castle; *gamla*, in Swedish, is old, and *Gamla Karleby* old Charlestown; *tell* is a hill, and *Tell el Kebir* is the great hill, and so forth. A collection of words, phrases, noteworthy sayings, and colloquial expressions in current use will be found of great service to those whose early education has not made them familiar with Latin and French. A list of abbreviations with their meanings concludes the work.

The making of a dictionary, or even the preparation of a new edition, is a work of such stupendous labour that one hardly ventures even to let one's imagination dwell upon it. In a more enlightened age such work as this and the making of catalogues, calendars, lists of names, men, members, prices, and so forth will be assigned to convicts, who will all of course in the future have received an excellent education. Probably the composition of verses for Christmas cards, crackers, and valentines will also form part of the convict labour of posterity. However that may be, the making of dictionaries will most certainly be assigned to the prisoners, and one may picture the well-conducted convict being rewarded by promotion to oakum-picking as lighter and more pleasing work. Not the least serious part of the undertaking is the immense accumulation of knowledge, encyclopædic and universal knowledge, which must form the unavoidable penalty of such work, so that a man who has actually "done" a dictionary must be like one of those great scholars of old who knew everything that there was to be known. Now there is, for most of us, a limit to one's curiosity and yearning after knowledge. In some branches we do not desire to possess even a smattering of knowledge. Perhaps, even for the dictionary-maker, not more than an introduction or bowing acquaintance only is wanted in many departments of learning. We observe, for instance, that the science of trigonometry is indicated, rather than explained, by Mr. Annandale, while under the head Quaternion the editor wisely refrains from attempting a popular explanation of that branch of mathematics, and confines himself to an extract from Sir William Hamilton which leaves the matter still a mystery to the vulgar; yet, on the other hand, under the head of "Benthamism" we find a clear and concise statement of the doctrine so called. Also, the whole of the natural history definitions, descriptions, and explanations seem to be not only accurate, but sufficiently full. It must be remembered that in the case of scientific entries the editor must not only see that nothing is omitted, but that every entry is accurately explained and brought up to the most recent discoveries. Consider what this means in the rapid advance which science in almost every department is now making. Again, to illustrate still further the labour of dictionary work, there is the trouble of finding and enumerating all the meanings of every word, past and present, and

* *The Imperial Dictionary of the English Language.* By John Ogilvie, LL.D. New Edition. Edited by Charles Annandale, M.A. 4 vols. Blackie & Son. 1883.

the various senses in which it is employed. Thus, to take the single word *throw*. There are, first, twelve distinct usages of the word, of which four are strictly technical (which shows that a maker of dictionaries should, in order to know the technical usages of words, be familiar with every kind of industry, labour, or manufacture); next, there are fifteen idiomatic combinations of *throw*—such as to *throw up*, to *throw off*, to *throw out*, to *throw away*—every one of which may be applied in two or more ways.

Considering, therefore, the extraordinary labour and drudgery of the work, its immense value and importance, the care with which every word must be turned out, the perils of omission as well as of commission, we cannot praise too highly the man who brings a great dictionary to a successful termination. Mr. Annandale will have his reward, we hope, in the consciousness that his will be for many years the most serviceable and most highly valued of English dictionaries. There is one branch of the work in which he is to be especially congratulated—the selection of quotations. Some of these are very happy; some are quaint; there is not a page of the Dictionary which is not made really pleasant reading, if somewhat desultory, by the introduction of these passages. The number of authors consulted and quoted is about fifteen hundred, according to the list which is placed in the fourth volume. It is a list which pretty well exhausts English literature, present and past. Yet there are one or two singular omissions. Blackmore is in the list; but Hardy, a most invaluable author for the editor of a dictionary, is not. All kinds of comparatively small contemporary writers are laid under contribution, but Professor Seeley is passed over; while of older writers Tom Brown is admitted, but his contemporary Ned Ward forgotten. These omissions, however, are to be expected, and one man cannot read everything.

COLONEL MALLESON'S LORD CLIVE.*

THERE may be a doubt as to the necessity for a new biography of Clive after Macaulay's Essay, which is read by everybody, and Malcolm's Life, which is read by few. But, granting that there is still room for a detailed account of the events which transformed a raw Shropshire lad into the founder of our Empire in the East, there is no fault to be found with the manner in which Colonel Malleeson has acquitted himself of his task. Some of this author's recent publications have seemed to us to show signs of haste. One or two were apparently written to save a party or to prop a theory. No objection of this kind can be brought against a volume for which original narratives, half-forgotten publications, and French memoirs have been consulted and analysed. The style is good. The descriptions of military manoeuvres are clear; and the character of the soldier and the statesman is drawn with discrimination and candour. Occasionally Colonel Malleeson tries to bend the bow of Lord Beaconsfield, and to teach history by apophthegms, as when he reminds us that "prudence is always daring," or else that the charter of the East India Company "placed the affairs of a distant Empire in the hands of a Joint-stock Company." He has prefaced his work with an excellent table of contents, drawn out on the plan adopted by such historians as Lord Macaulay and Lord Stanhope; but occasionally we are surprised by a sensational heading to a chapter. "The deglutition of Bengal" suggests the notion of a bon-constrictor swallowing a rabbit at a country show, and it is not very easy to see how this odd term applies to the portion of a narrative taken up with the gift of a Zemindary in the Twenty-four Pergunahs by Mir Jafar to Clive, and the beating which Colonel Forde administered to the Dutch in obedience to Clive's note in pencil written from the card-table, and telling him to "fight them immediately." Another chapter devoted to the attacks made on Clive after his return home in 1767, by proprietors of East India stock, by the Deputy Chairman of the Court of Directors, and by certain members of the House of Commons, is presented to us under the title "What kind of success is that?" This sort of thing may do very well for some essayist who asks the community in the nineteenth century whether their life is worth living; but Clive's life, strategy, statesmanship, and fortunes are of themselves so interesting that they can well dispense with this flashiness. For Colonel Malleeson has turned out a piece of literary research and workmanship which ought to afford some instruction and pleasure to readers who have not time to hunt up Malcolm, and who would like to know the exact evidence on which some of Macaulay's brilliant essay rests. Now and then the author stumbles. For instance, Clive's defence in the House of Commons fell on the public "like the spear of Priam on the armour of Achilles." If the author is thinking of the second *Æneid*, we may remind him that the old King's *imbelles telum* fell on the shield of Neoptolemus, who, Priam is made to say, falsely boasted that Achilles was his father. At p. 389 we hear of the Annual Revenue Settlement known as the *Puna*. This might lead readers to imagine that some sort of system or temporary settlement of the Revenue was intended, anterior either to the Quinquennial, the Decennial, or the Perpetual Settlement of Bengal. The real term is *Punyah* or *Punya*, and it is in use with Zemindars, their agents, and rent-paying ryots, all over the province to this hour. It signifies the time at which the first instalment of rent falls due;

but it is observed more as a holiday than a day of accounts and business, and it generally occurs in the month of Asarh, or June, with the first rains and the season for renewed agricultural operations. In spelling and transliteration Colonel Malleeson is a stricter purist than Mr. Hunter. Great strides have recently been made in comparative philology, and in precision of titles, names, and places. But we still confess to a preference for Oude or Oudh over Awadh. The ancient fort of Budge-Budge, thirteen miles below Calcutta, once captured by a drunken sailor who was as valiant as the soldier of Lucullus described by Horace, looks queerly as Baj-Baj; and it would hardly be proper or moral to request an irascible subaltern to spell and pronounce the old artillery cantonment of Dum-Dum, near Calcutta, as Colonel Malleeson persists in writing it. One more criticism, and we shall turn to Clive himself. The unfortunate native who lost his reason because he lost the thirty lacks of rupees demanded by him as the price of secrecy in 1757 has hitherto been known as Omichund. Though Orme thus spells his name, and though this spelling has been adopted by other standard writers since Orme, it needs little acquaintance with Oriental nomenclature to be confident that no native ever really bore that appellation. Colonel Malleeson, relying on his friend Mr. Pincott, thinks he has solved the question by deriving the name from *ami*, a corruption of *amrita*, "ambrosia," and *chand*. The name would then be written Amichand, and would signify "the nectar of the moon." But Amichand, so derived, is no more a current native name than Omichund. We challenge Mr. Pincott or Colonel Malleeson to produce a single native who ever was known as "The Nectar of the Moon." One explanation of Orme's spelling is that the real name may have been Umachand, a name about as current amongst Hindus as Green or White with us. But we are indebted to a friend, a thoroughly sound Orientalist both in theory and practice, for a better suggestion—that the name was Amin Chand. The term *Amin*, though Persian, is constantly adopted by Hindus; and in conversation, the *n* being elided or dropped, the name is pronounced Ami-chand. An *Amin*, we need only mention, is an arbitrator, a native judge, or valuator; and it has no connexion with *amrita* or ambrosia. *Amrita* Lall, however, is a name often borne by natives. The truth is that any amount of ponderous Oriental learning is of little use in identifying native names corrupted from the Sanskrit or the Arabic, unless it be combined with some practical knowledge of the way in which natives slur over, mouth, twist, torture, and disfigure Aryan and Iranian terms.

It may startle some readers to be told that a nephew of Lord Clive, Baron Plassey, who was born, as Colonel Malleeson reminds us, in 1725 and died in 1774, is still living. This venerable gentleman is the son of William, who was younger than his celebrated brother by just twenty years. He is known to the world as Archdeacon Clive. Other members of William Clive's family lived quite down to our own time. Clive's personal history is part and parcel of the history of our early conquests in Bengal and Southern India at three critical epochs. The first includes our rivalry with the French in the very middle of the last century, when it seemed quite possible that Duplex and Bussy combined would altogether efface the English settlements in the South of India. The second period refers to the capture and recapture of Calcutta and to the victory of Plassey. In the third, which only occupies one year and a half, Clive managed to stem the tide of official corruption, to put down a most serious mutiny, not of sepoys but of the English officers of the Bengal army, and to obtain from the Emperor of Delhi the celebrated grant of the Dewanni, or Revenues of Bengal, Behar, and part of Orissa. All these periods are treated by Colonel Malleeson at considerable and not unnecessary length. He rescues from obscurity the name of the civilian Governor of Fort St. David, Mr. Saunders, who was quick enough to discern the capacity latent in a young writer who had only just smelt powder in the field and who had twice attempted to commit suicide. An incapable military officer named Gingen had so mismanaged matters that a short campaign resulted in defeat, disaster, and depression. How a rapid transformation was effected by the activity of Clive and the tactics of Major Stringer Lawrence; how Arcot was defended, the French commander defeated, and Trichinopoly saved, is well told. Colonel Malleeson makes no mention of the celebrated story about the sepoys in Arcot proposing that the English soldiers should have the rice to eat, and the natives content themselves with the gruel or water in which it was boiled; and we have seen this valuable and cherished incident thrown aside as a pure myth by more than one recent writer. It may therefore be as well to remind readers that this sham diamond or real pearl of history, whichever it may be, rests on the authority of Sir John Malcolm, who says that he "had it from authority I cannot doubt." Now Sir John Malcolm went to India as a cadet in 1782, not so very long after the siege of Arcot. He was an accomplished scholar, a sound Orientalist, and an excellent interpreter of native character and conversation. Macaulay himself said of Niebuhr that it was not easy to see how that erudite German could pronounce Martial to be wrong about the quantity of the second syllable in *Porsena* when he must have heard it pronounced a hundred times before he left school. In like manner, we say, it is not very clear how any writer of the present day can be justified in pronouncing Malcolm utterly wrong in adopting a story which it would hardly have occurred to a native to invent, and which, if without foundation, the able Political Agent or Resident would have been the first to detect and explode. There must have been Brahmin cooks amongst the

* *The Founders of the Indian Empire: Clive, Warren Hastings, and Wellesley.—Lord Clive.* By Colonel G. B. Malleeson, C.S.I., Author of the "History of the French in India." With a Portrait and Four Plans. London: Allen & Co. 1882.

besieged at Arcot. There would be nothing contrary to native ideas and practice in the sepoys drinking the *ganji pani*, or rice gruel, prepared by such high caste men, after the solid portion had been made over to the English garrison. But whether this anecdote, like so many others, is destined to disappear from history or not, it is quite certain that in nine years Clive had annihilated the supremacy of the French, had saved the English Settlements, had impressed the natives of Southern India with awe and admiration of the English valour and character, and had evinced a genius for warfare in a strange country such as commanded the approval of two such opposite characters as Lord Chesterfield and William Pitt.

After two years' stay in England, during which Clive was returned to Parliament for the Cornish borough of St. Michael's, but was unseated on petition, he returned to India at the close of 1755. He had just time to aid Admiral Watson in putting down the notorious pirate Tullagi Angria, who had been capturing English and French merchantmen destined for the Western Presidency, when he was summoned to Calcutta from the Madras Presidency by the catastrophe of the Black Hole. Colonel Malleon devotes several pages to the recapture of Calcutta, which preceded Plassey by about four months, and his local knowledge shows to advantage in a detailed account of certain operations carried on by Clive in the suburbs of the Presidency town. The fair conclusion is that, amidst gardens and banks and ditches, cocoa-nut and date plantations, and a thick fog, such as even now in February warns the residents of Calcutta that their brief cold season is on the turn to heat, the troops got rather bewildered and the operation was not completely successful. But the Nawab was thoroughly frightened and everything was set right just four months afterwards. A tourist may still find Plassey in capital letters on the map of Bengal in the Zillah of Nuddea, and at no great distance from its head station of Kishnagar. Plassey, if our memory serves us aright, was and is of sufficient importance to be one of the ten or twelve police stations into which a populous district like Nuddea is cut up. Colonel Malleon's careful and full account of the battle is illustrated by a map showing the windings of the Bhagirathi river, the grove of mango-trees, the hunting-box of the Nawab, and the position of the rival forces. The grove, and the exact spot on which more than fifty thousand Asiatics were scattered by a mixed force of three thousand English and natives, have long since disappeared in the changes and vagaries of a stream which has so often perplexed the intelligence of topographers and defied the skill of engineers. We have heard from natives whose grandfathers lived in those times, that the Oriental portions of Clive's army were known to the Bengalis of Nuddea as Telingas, because they came, or were supposed to have accompanied him, from Telingana or Madras. It is quite certain that not one of Clive's sepoys had been enlisted from Upper India, while the Nawab's cavalry, and probably some of his infantry, were of "the bolder race which inhabits the Northern Provinces." That the victory of June 1757 led to the grant of the Dewanni eight years afterwards there can be no doubt; and when, after a rule of a hundred years, an attempt was made to rouse the courage, fanaticism, and superstition of thousands of revolted sepoys by telling them that Allah had granted to the foreigner only a century of dominion, it was happily found that, in spite of mistakes and panics and surrenders, there were still captains and civilians who showed that they were prepared to uphold the Empire extended by Wellesley and Dalhousie with something of the fearlessness and the capacity of Clive.

The Patna massacre of October 1763 and other untoward occurrences compelled the perplexed Directors to turn to Clive, and he went once more to India with powers which, if not absolute, were sufficient to enable him to deal with corruption and disorder. Clive landed in Calcutta in the beginning of May 1765. The 12th of August following, by a coincidence which a sportsman would hail with delight, was made memorable by the grant of a *sumud* from the Emperor of Delhi making over the revenues of three fine provinces to the Company. Clive at the same time set himself to reform the Civil Service. He passed an order forbidding civilians to receive presents or gratuities; he restricted their private trade in salt, tobacco, and betel-nut, in which a young writer drawing 60 rupees a month gave his name and his rights to some energetic Baboo or Banyan who had local knowledge and capital; and, by depriving it of its worst abuses, prepared the way for the reforms of Lord Cornwallis, who assigned ample salaries to every judge, magistrate, and collector, and confined them to their proper functions of governing the country. A more serious trial awaited Clive in the conspiracy of the English officers of the Bengal army, headed by Sir Robert Fletcher. These gentlemen may have had some ground of complaint in the abolition or diminution of certain allowances known as double batta, single batta, and half batta. For the mode by which they attempted to redress their grievances there is not a shade of excuse. Clive dealt with this formidable crisis in his usual vigorous fashion. He struck down the ringleaders, reasoned with the wavering, restored the penitent, placed reliance on the sepoys, and called up English volunteers from the army at Madras and the civil community of Calcutta. In the end of January 1767 he handed over the government to Mr. Verelst, whose quiet tenure of office formed a fitting prelude to the stormy and yet able administration of Hastings. After encountering opposition in England, and trials scarcely inferior to those he had surmounted in Bengal, his brilliant career closed in November 1774. The late Lord Stanhope, in chapter 67, vol. viii. of his History, states that Clive committed suicide with a

penknife with which he had just mended a pen for a young lady, an attached friend of the family, on a visit at his house in Berkeley Square. Lord Stanhope adds that this anecdote "was related by the Earl of Shelburne, afterwards the first Marquess of Lansdowne, to the person from whom I received it." But we do not doubt that irrepressible critics will arise to class this incident with the rice-water of Arcot.

There is rarely in history any character in which the lines are so marked, the colours so vivid, the contrasts so easy to comprehend and explain. The celebrated episode of the forging of Admiral Watson's signature was the act of a man who had really nothing underhand or treacherous in his nature. In all probability Clive would not have sworn falsely on oath or drawn a cheque in another man's name to gain for himself the grant of the Dewanny. Macaulay shows in two clear and well-reasoned pages that, while Orientals may lie, cheat, and deceive each other, the highest English envoy, the humblest civil functionary, must not deviate one hair's breadth from the line of rectitude and truth. "English valour and English intelligence," he says, "have done less to extend and preserve our Oriental Empire than English veracity." Clive's mistake was in thinking that it was quite fair to outwit an unscrupulous intriguer by the use of his favourite or familiar weapons. In all the other events of his chequered career there are some few things which may be excused, and many which might be imitated, by a public man of the highest character. It may be doubted, though Macaulay seems to think it, whether history will find many points of resemblance between Clive and Lord William Bentinck. But as soldier and statesman he will stand out as the worthy forerunner of Wellesley, the two Hastings, Dalhousie, and Canning. Classical readers may recall the phrases applied by Livy, Lib. V., to the Dictator Camillus, the *fatalis dux*, as he terms him, or heaven-born general. Some of them fit Clive's career exactly. "Omnia repente mutaverat imperator mutatus. Alia spes, alius animus, fortuna quoque alia urbis videri. Omnium primum in eos, qui a Veis in illo pavore fugerant, more militari animadvertit, effectique ne hostis maxime timendus militi esset." And again, with regard to our own native levies, "Peregrina etiam juvenus, Latini Hemicique, operam suam pollicentes, ad id bellum venero . . . fuit enim vir unicus in omni fortuna, princeps pace belloque."

"ENGINEERING" SERIES.

THIS is undoubtedly the most important technical book on electrical subjects which has yet appeared. Those who have followed the articles on this new branch of the engineer's art in "Engineering" know how valuable they have been; but in the present volume there is so much new matter and the old has been so much amplified that this work has the character of a new treatise on the subject. The earlier chapters are devoted to a lucid explanation of what is called generally electrical theory, dealing with units, measurement, and the theory of the dynamo machine. This last subject has been treated in a masterly manner by Professor Silvanus P. Thompson, who first works out the theory from Faraday's conception of the lines of force of a magnetic field and the production of currents by the motion of a conductor across these lines, and afterwards explains the action by starting with the experimental fact that a direct or "continuous" current dynamo machine is reversible—i.e., that if supplied with a current it will act as a motor. This method of first explaining forwards and then backwards appears very valuable as a teaching instrument, as one explanation or the other is pretty certain to be understood. Of the other theoretical chapters we cannot speak so highly. In the first place, we think it a pity that, in the chapter on Ohm's law and its derivatives, the French term "*intensité*" should have been retained in its Anglicized form, "*intensity*," and by using the symbol *I*, instead of *C*, so that the formula of Ohm's law reads, as in the French text-books, $I = \frac{E}{R}$ instead of $C = \frac{E}{R}$, the form in which English electricians generally write it. Our reason for this objection is that we cannot destroy our old race of practical electricians or their nomenclature. They were, and still are, in the habit of speaking of "quantity currents" and "intensity currents"—meaning thereby large currents produced by a low electromotive force and small currents produced by a high electromotive force. Thus "*intensity*" is a familiar word to them; and, as far as any meaning definitely belongs to it, it means electromotive force; whilst "*quantity*" represents current strength—the English *C* and the French *I* of Ohm's law. Indeed the "quantity" and "intensity" or "tension" coils of the telegraphist's "detector" roughly measure current strength, independently of electromotive force, and electromotive force by itself.

We find a footnote to a chapter on arranging circuits in series or in parallel arc—"that is, either for '*intensity*,' or for '*quantity*,' as the older electricians used to say before they understood Ohm's law. The former case gives currents of great electromotive force; in the latter, the internal resistance is small. Since an '*intense*'

* *Electric Illumination*. By Conrad Cooke, M. F. O'Reilly, James Dredge, S. P. Thompson, and H. Vivarez. Edited by James Dredge. (Chiefly compiled from "Engineering.") With Abstracts of Specifications having reference to Electric Lighting. Prepared by W. Lloyd Wise, Member of Council of the Institute of Patent Agents. Vol. I. London: Offices of "Engineering." New York: Wiley & Sons.

current and a strong 'current' mean the same thing, the old terms should be allowed to die—the sooner the better." So say we; but we doubt whether using the old terms in a new sense will kill them in their older sense. Will it not rather confuse the minds of electricians who do not even yet understand Ohm's law, and prevent their ever having faith in what they are too apt to think is a mere toy of the much-despised "theoretical man" and "laboratory electrician"? Before passing on to the consideration of this book as a whole, and of its great merits, we must comment on the following passage—"The constancy in the intensity of the chemical work at all points of a circuit tends to show that electricity should not be regarded as energy *per se*, but as its vehicle. According to the comparison of M. Marcel Deprez, it is no more a form of energy than a column of water under pressure or a driving-belt. In fact, it is not lost, but is always found the same at different points of the circuit, the potential only varying." It is remarkable that from Professor Silvanus Thompson we always get lucid exposition, great grasp of the subject, and evidence of extensive reading; but all these merits are almost invariably balanced by some such talk as this. As investigation goes on, and our ignorance of the mechanism of electrical phenomena diminishes, so we feel, or, in our opinion, ought to feel, that we have no right to assert that such a thing as "electricity" exists at all. Many years ago Professor Fleeming Jenkin enunciated something very like this proposition in his text-book of electricity. We believe that he has never publicly given any indication of his views having been modified. Now let us briefly run over what we know and see if there is any necessity for anything to be called electricity as a substantive, or any indication of the existence of any such thing. First, take a conductor which is said to be electrified; we find that, in order that it may be in that state, it must be completely surrounded by other matter having certain properties, which make it what is called a dielectric. We know that this dielectric is in a state of strain in that part which immediately surrounds the electrified conductor; and that on the other side, where the dielectric is again near bodies which are capable of being electrified, but which are not completely surrounded by a dielectric, it is strained equally, but in such a manner that, if the one strain be considered as a positive quantity, the other will be represented by a negative quantity. If these strains are transferred to the same spot they neutralize each other. If the strains are great and the dielectric thin, it is broken across, and the strains disappear. In this last case the conductors on each side of the dielectric often throw off particles of their substance from one to the other, which may perhaps indicate that their molecules also are in some condition of strain. From considering these strains from the point of view of the real existence of the luminiferous æther, Professor Clerk Maxwell not only showed that strains of this æther would account for the phenomena, but further arrived at the conclusion that conductors are opaque to light, which completely accords with experience; and that insulators or dielectrics are transparent to light, which is also true, it having been found that a large quantity of light is transmitted through relatively great thicknesses of black vulcanite. It is indeed quite possible to see the form of brightly illuminated objects through a thickness of several millimetres of this substance.

Let us now see what we know about a current. Whilst bodies separated by a strained dielectric attract or repel each other according to circumstances, a body surrounded by a strained dielectric, or, in ordinary terms, a charged body, behaves towards another conductor in precisely the same way, whether this other conductor be "conveying a current" or no. Nor is its behaviour altered by the magnetic condition of the other conductor; but when a conductor is "conveying a current," we find that the surrounding medium exhibits strains of a new kind. We do not in this case find equal and opposite strains elsewhere, but we do find that two conductors "conveying currents" attract and repel each other, and also influence the position of magnets. Now round magnets we find the same kind of strains, and by suitably arranging our conductors, we can cause them to behave like magnets. Again, Professor Clerk Maxwell has shown that strains of the luminiferous æther will account for all the movements and changes of position set up by the mutual action of magnets or currents or magnets and currents. As to the mechanism of the current itself we know little; but as a charged conductor when moving rapidly acts on a current or on a magnet precisely like a current, and as a charge is a strain, we are sometimes led to look upon a current as a propagation of a state of strain, or, in other words, as a vibration. Now in all this, which is a rough and very incomplete sketch of the state of knowledge of the mechanism of electrical phenomena, there is no trace of anything which can be called electricity. The all-pervading element is the luminiferous æther. There may also be strains and movements of the molecules of matter. In our imperfect state of knowledge these ideas are too large and too complex, as well as too vague, to form a hypothesis which will act as a *memoria technica* for electrical phenomena, or enable us to work out fresh electrical problems. But the hypothesis of electricity does answer this purpose; but to attempt gravely to discuss the true nature of electricity is about as idle as to discuss the colour and weight of the root of minus one. We would wish, then, that all who write on this subject should avoid the use of the word electricity, except in dealing with electrostatic phenomena, where it may be used for the sake of clearness; but even in this case it should always be guarded by a few words of explanation lest the reader be led astray.

To return, however, to the technical part of this work, we find

it of the highest value. The present volume contains the description of dynamos, systems of distribution, arc and incandescent lamps. Each of the subjects is treated historically, and almost all the more modern apparatus is fully described and figured. It is a difficult matter, in the face of the innumerable different forms which are now in existence, to decide offhand on the accuracy of the descriptions; the names of the authors and the high reputation of *Engineering* as a technical journal ought to be sufficient guarantees of their fidelity. We, however, notice one curious error which has crept in. The lamp described as Mr. Crompton's arc lamp is a lamp which Mr. Crompton certainly once made and, we believe, once exhibited, but is not the lamp which is so well known as the Crompton lamp. It is, perhaps, the long list of abstracts of patents, and the full description of some of the earlier ones given in the text, which form the most important features of this work. They will be found invaluable to all who may be engaged in patent suits which have reference to electric lighting, though perhaps lawyers may find to their cost that the publication of this work has caused many owners of patents to hesitate before bringing actions. It really does appear after looking through this book that it would be impossible for any patent for any known form of arc or incandescent lamp to be valid, unless its claims were so reduced by disclaimer that the invention would be practically given to the world.

We learn from the concluding paragraph of the Preface that this volume is to be followed by a second, devoted to other subjects connected with electric lighting. We hope that when this second volume appears we may have a second edition of the first, and that a little more care may be taken in arranging it for the press. It is curious to observe in a book, otherwise so well got up, the old country newspaper device of using a figure 5 inverted instead of a special type for the French c. However, in spite of small blemishes, this is an excellent and carefully compiled work, and one which will be found of inestimable value to all who are connected either by business or by taste with electric lighting.

A SYRIAC CHRONICLE.*

THIS edition of a valuable Chronicle was preceded by one of the original Syriac text, edited by the Abbé P. Martin in 1876, and by the abridged Latin version of Assemani. But Professor Wright found himself in a position to present a much correcter text than that of M. Martin; and even were it not so, he would need no apology for publishing a new edition which makes the Chronicle easily accessible to English students and general readers. His critical notes show scrupulous care in the preparation of the text, and no hesitation in emendation where absolutely necessary for grammatical reasons; and it is satisfactory to learn from the preface that many of the emendations of Professor Wright and others proved to be the original readings of the MS. No higher testimony can be given to the soundness of an editor's judgment than this; but Professor Wright does not need it. The work is written in a pleasant style; is, as we shall show, very interesting; and is thoroughly well edited. It may therefore be recommended to students of Syriac, whose stock of available literature is not too large.

The original title prefixed to the Chronicle is (in Dr. Wright's translation), "A History of the Time of Affliction at Ōrhāi [Edessa] and Āmid, and throughout all Mesopotamia." It comprises an annual record of the events of the years 494-506, during the reigns of the Byzantine Emperor Anastasius and of Kawād (Cabadis, Cobad, &c.), King of Persia, and is preceded by a summary of some twenty preceding years of the reign of Zeno. It is addressed to a certain Abbot Sergius, probably of some abbey in the district of Edessa, and was written avowedly in answer to a request from him for an eye-witness's account of the terrible time of famine, pestilence, and brutality at Edessa during the Persian war. As the picture drawn by a contemporary and actual witness of all these events, it must occupy one of the highest places among the chronicles which form the materials of history; and its importance is enhanced by the general darkness of the period and the country which it describes. Moreover, the reader soon finds that it is not valuable from these external considerations only; he discovers a spirit of candour and of caution to pervade all the chronicler's assertions, which gains his confidence and convinces him that the work is not that of a violent partisan or of a romancer; while the details with which it abounds, such as the varying prices of corn, show the writer to be not only well informed about events, but of sound judgment as to the relative importance of the several things he had it in his power to tell. As an Eastern Christian and an anchorite, he has his peculiar interpretations of calamities as Divine judgments for certain specified sins, and gives a long list of miracles—wonders in the earth and in the heaven; but these are kept distinct, and do not seem to interfere with his historical truthfulness. Indeed the calamities may be accepted as true, without the writer's declaration of the reason which determined the Divine mind to inflict them; and the miracles will often yield easily to a rationalistic interpretation. The writer seems perfectly simple-minded, able and desirous to give a full and clear account of the events he is called upon to narrate, not afraid of pronouncing an opinion on the characters of

* *The Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite*. Composed in Syriac, A.D. 507. With a Translation and Notes by W. Wright, LL.D. Cambridge: University Press. 1882.

persons, and only careful not to trespass beyond the limits of his record.

In a passage in his preface Joshua shows that his zeal for religious readings of history has not blinded his common sense. "For," he writes, "although this was stirred up against us because of our sins, yet it took its origin in certain obvious facts, which I am going to relate to thee, that thou mayest . . . not be led, along with some foolish persons, to blame the all-ruling and believing Emperor Anastasius; for he was not the exciting cause of the war, but it was provoked from a much earlier time." He then begins his narrative, and states that there was a treaty between the Greek Empire and the Persians, that either might receive from the other, in case of stress of war with some other nation, help in the shape of men or money; that the Greeks had never required this, but the Persians had frequently, and especially Pêrôz (Firûz), for his wars against the Huns. His successor, Balâsh, however, had sent a request for aid to the Emperor Zeno which was refused; and Balâsh, being unable to pay his troops, was blinded and deposed. Kawâd, son of Pêrôz, who was then set up in his stead, sent to the Emperor Anastasius, who had succeeded Zeno, a similar demand for money, backed by a threat of war in case of refusal. Anastasius refused the demand, with the words "As Zeno, who reigned before me, did not send it, so neither will I send it, until thou restorest to me Nisibis; for the wars are not trifling which I have to carry on with the barbarians who are called the Germans, and with those who are called the Blemyes, and with many others; and I will not neglect the Greek troops and feed thine." Anastasius had soon another war on his hands, for the subjection of a rebellion among the Isaurians; and Kawâd, thinking this trouble might frighten the Emperor into buying off his hostility, made a second attempt, but met with a still more decided refusal. "If thou askest it as a loan, I will send it to thee; but if as a matter of custom, I will not neglect the Greek armies, which are sore put to it in the war with the Isaurians, and become a helper of the Persians." These sayings show the high opinion held by Joshua of the character of Anastasius; and they are strengthened by later incidents, such as his willingness to remit the entire taxes of a province distressed by famine or war, his benevolence in sending money for the poor at Edessa during the famine, and the like. So strong is this predilection for Anastasius, that the following sentence is added at the end by way of apology (written, Dr. Wright thinks, by a later hand):—"If this Emperor appears in a different aspect towards the end of his life, let no one be offended at his praises, but let him remember the things that Solomon did at the close of his life."

One of the first questions we ask of a Chronicle like this is, of course, what it adds to our knowledge of its period, and where it differs from narratives obtained from other sources. We are especially interested in comparing the accounts given by Oriental writers with those obtained from the Byzantine Greeks, who have furnished our historians with most of their matter. The account of the revolt of Illus is important in this aspect. Gibbon omits it altogether, we believe; but there is an account of it in Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, s. v., "Illus," based on Byzantine authorities, which differs in important points from this Syriac version. According to the latter, Illus, military governor of Antioch, and an Isaurian, like the Emperor Zeno, was originally the confidant of the latter, and employed by him to build and provision the fortress Papurium in Isauria. When this was done, Zeno suspected him of aiming at the throne, and ordered a soldier to kill him, but the sword was knocked aside by another soldier, and only cut off Illus's ear. Zeno ordered the assassin to be killed immediately, to prevent any disclosure of his own complicity, but thereby rather increased than allayed Illus's suspicions, and the latter went back to Antioch to await his opportunity. Zeno attempted in vain to draw him to Constantinople, and then despatched a general, Leontius, with troops, to bring him by force. But Leontius was tempted by Illus's gold to make common cause with him and rebel against Zeno, who was hated as a barbarian by the Greeks. Zeno, however, sent an able general, John (the Seythian), with a large army, against them, and they were defeated and forced to fly to the fortress of Papurium, where they were besieged by John, and ultimately betrayed, and put to death by the order of Zeno. In the Greek account, Papurium is spoken of as already existing before Illus's time; the assassin who cut off Illus's ear was employed, not by Zeno, but by his wife Ariadne, and Zeno "was unable to prevent his execution." Nothing is said of Leontius's mission to bring Illus back from Antioch; on the contrary, Leontius simply joined him there. The Syriac story says nothing of several persons who in the other take part in these events—Illus's brother Trocondus, the Empresses Verina and Ariadne, and others. But, though certainly not a full history, it contains some original elements which seem worthy of credence.

The varying prices of corn at Edessa are carefully noted by Joshua. Thus in a time of ordinary abundance thirty modii of wheat or fifty of barley were sold for a gold denarius of Byzantium; but during a terrible famine no more than four of wheat or six of barley could be had for the denarius, the numbers rising afterwards to twelve and twenty-two respectively, and again sinking during the war to four and six. It appears that these famine prices lasted, with but little alleviation, for about ten terrible years, first of drought and then of war (A.D. 495-505). The figures strongly corroborate the horrible stories of the state of the country during those years, when the Emperor Anastasius had repeatedly to remit taxation to a population that was dying of starvation by thousands, and at the conclusion of the war, when

large sums of money had to be distributed among the poor. The plagues of boils or tumours, which are graphically described by Joshua, are piously regarded by him as intended by God as "a mirror for us, . . . that by means of our exterior He might show us what our interior was like unto, and that by means of the scars of our bodies we might learn how hideous were the scars of our souls." He mentions, however, that the new governor "cleared the streets of the city of filth"; and we shall hardly be wrong in treating this filth as one cause of the diseases previously described. The famine is described with details such as we are familiar with in other accounts of similar calamities, and we need not quote them; but they are especially striking when coming from so remote an age and from an Oriental chronicler. The Syrians, however, whatever their shortcomings in morality may be, show a true spirit of Christian benevolence, which appears to advantage beside the Pagan brutality and indifference to suffering. The people of Edessa used to assemble at the gate of the *ξενοδοχείον* in the morning and bury those who had died in the night; the clergy established an infirmary among the buildings attached to the Great Church; the wealthy formed other infirmaries; the Greek soldiers made places for the sick, and charged themselves with the expense. "They died by a painful and melancholy death; and, though many of them were buried every day" (he afterwards says from a hundred to a hundred and thirty from the *ξενοδοχείον* alone), "the number still went on increasing. For a report had gone forth throughout the province of Edessa that the Edessenes took good care of those who were in want, and for this reason a countless multitude of people entered the city." It is expressly mentioned that every one, from the governor and the bishop downwards, was most diligent in providing burial by opening of new graves and utilizing old disused cemeteries, and thus coping with the most dangerous evil of the pestilence. The next year (A.D. 501-2) brought relief through an abundant harvest.

As to the war, the siege of Amida by Kawâd, King of Persia, which is dismissed by Gibbon in three dry sentences, is here narrated at great length, and so as to produce a vivid impression of the brutalities of ancient, and especially Oriental, warfare, and leave us wondering how any people were left to inhabit regions exposed to such terrible and demoralizing calamities. The Persians lost during three months 50,000 men; and on the other side 80,000 dead bodies of the Amidenes were carried out of the city by one gate only, besides those borne out by other gates after the Persians had got possession of the city. Yet this was not all. It was hardly to be expected that Anastasius would acquiesce in the loss of his city; and so Amida was no sooner relieved from one siege than it had to suffer another, which lingered for two years, and ended in an arrangement by which the Persian garrison was let out, and the place remained to the Greeks. But before this end came, the sufferings from famine had become so intense as to produce murders and cannibalism; and when this was prevented, the bodies of the dead were openly used to satisfy the cravings of hunger. And while this was the state of things inside the fortress, "to the Greek troops, however, nought was lacking, but everything was supplied to them in its season, and came down with great care by the order of the Emperor." The system of warfare was on both sides the most brutal imaginable. The Greeks, going on forays into the Persian territory, found the Persian cavalry on the further side of the Tigris.

The Greeks crossed after them, and destroyed all the Persian cavalry, who were about 10,000 men, and plundered the property of the fugitives. They burned many villages, and killed every male that was in them from twelve years old and upwards, but the women and children they took prisoners. For the Magister had thus commanded all the generals, that if any one of the Greeks was found saving a male from twelve years old and upwards, he should be put to death in his stead; and whatsoever village they entered, that they should not leave a single house standing in it.

Edessa only suffered a siege from the Persians twice for a short time, but was not taken. This was believed to be the fulfilment of a promise made by Our Lord to King Abgar of Edessa, in an apocryphal letter preserved by Eusebius, in which He is made to say, "Thy city shall be blessed, and no enemy shall ever make himself master of it." At last the Greeks were utterly weary of the war, and Mesopotamia was exhausted, and peace was made (A.D. 506) without difficulty on either side. Joshua is hopeful that a great change for the better is going to take place in the world, and concludes his Chronicle with the sentiment:—

Just as we have been unable to describe the wants of these evil times as they really were, because of the abundance of their afflictions, so also may we be unable to tell of those that are coming, because of the multitude of their blessings. And may our words be too feeble to speak of the happy life of our fellow-citizens, and of the calm and peace that shall reign throughout the world, and of the great plenty that there shall be, and of the superabundance of the harvest of the blessing of God, who hath said, "The former troubles shall be forgotten and shall be hidden from before us."

STORIES BY AN OLD BOHEMIAN.*

IT is natural to expect the "Old Bohemian's" stories to be tales of Bohemia. But in these legends the author ignores "the beautiful city of Prague," and the realm of the Seven Castles, and the desolate country by the sea-shore. Perhaps one ought not to regret this, for Bohemia is almost or altogether "played out." "The bloom is off him now," said a votary of genius, speaking of the glaring publicity into which Mr. Rossetti's works

* Stories by an Old Bohemian. London: Tinsley Brothers. 1883.

have recently been thrust. The bloom is off Bohemia too, and things Bohemian. There was an age when few Englishmen had read Henry Murger, when Mimi Pinson also was known to few and faithful admirers. But now every Philistine is acquainted with Rodolphe and Schaunard, and the symphony on the influence of Blue in the arts, and the picture which originally represented Pharaoh crossing the Red Sea, but was finally altered into an advertisement of a Steamboat Company. All the world knows all these things; so much so that there has lately been an article even in *Blackwood's Magazine* on this country of Bohemia, recently discovered by some Scottish voyager. Clearly the bloom is off Bohemia, and we can readily forgive the Old Bohemian for having very little to say about his fatherland.

The Bohemian's tales have one very considerable merit—they are short. If the reader is bored by one, as perhaps he may be, he can turn to another. The book is a good one for the indolent and meretricious student. In many of the stories he gets plenty of plot. Murders and other crimes are committed with punctuality and despatch. The wrong person is suspected, just as he should be, and is sometimes punished and sometimes escapes. The reader has usually little difficulty in detecting the real sinner; that is the weak feature of most narratives of this kind. We presume that the tales are all original, as the Old Bohemian does not warn us that they are translations. Several of them, however, are almost German in all their qualities, and most of the scenes are laid in Germany, and the characters are Teutonic. Perhaps the imaginative difficulty of thinking oneself into the midst of foreign manners and customs may interfere with the success of these little romances. But we expect them to find a public, and they are just the sort of literature to beguile the time in a railway journey. We may now notice more particularly a few of the tales.

"The Old Candidate," with which the first volume begins, has a good title. One expects the hero to be one of those veteran "academic Liberals," or pushing City men, who pass all their days in vainly trying to secure a seat. These politicians, especially the forlorn academic Liberals, are types which novelists have neglected. Their importance; their mysteriousness; their certainty that they can solve the Irish, the Egyptian, the County Franchise, and all the other problems; their fond yearning belief in their own wisdom—all these things mark the "Old Candidates" of merry England as a class apart, a class with its humours and its solemn pathos. But the O. B.'s Old Candidate has nothing to do with England or with politics. He is simply a German "stickit minister" (we do not say "moonster" like Bishop Wilberforce, for fear of annoying Dr. McLeod), or rather the Old Candidate answers to an unsuccessful "probationer." He is a divine who cannot get a living, but ekes out his livelihood by giving lessons, and by having a world-wide reputation as a scholar. The story of the Old Candidate is excessively Teutonic. It is full of patient grotesque merit unrewarded. Once the old man gets the better of the Old Candidate, and he drubs a scoundrelly bully for beating his wife. After this touch of humanity, the Old Candidate relapses into self-denial, voluntary poverty, pulpit oratory, charitable works, and the enjoyment of his world-wide reputation. He is a fine, manly, inarticulate creature, a little too much after the manner of Tom Pinch. And when "Death the Friend" comes for the Old Candidate, the simple and sensitive will stain the page with a tear, and the brutal and cynical will ask the Old Bohemian for something more exciting and amusing. That we may not seem to side with these unsympathetic souls, we readily admit that the Old Candidate's story is simply and pathetically told, but the pathos is somewhat too well-worn.

"In Love and War" contains one of the oddest bits of plot we ever remember to have encountered. A fearful bully and martinet of a German baron (the kind of baron who cries "Bring me my boots!" in the *Ingoldsby Legends*) has bullied his wife into writing letters on the matrimonial affairs of several excellent and amorous young people. These letters will break about six hearts at least. But the youngest and prettiest of the ladies concerned has a happy thought, and at one dexterous blow rescues all the lovers from the ogre of a baron. How she did this must be the Old Bohemian's secret, which we do not intend to reveal. "Fatality" is not a very cunningly contrived tale, and unluckily goes on much the same lines as a better story, "A Psychological Puzzle." In "Fatality" we have a bankrupt, gambling young baron, who owes a large sum to a Chevalier. This Chevalier is a much worse fellow than our old friend, the Chevalier du Barry. As the Baron cannot pay, he insults the Chevalier, but the latter quite properly declines to fight a man who is in his debt. The Baron goes for the money to an old Frankfurt Jew, Lazarus Levi. Lazarus is like Mendoza in *Codlingsby*; he lives in luxury in his inner rooms, and covers his old fingers with diamonds. But he has "a filthy Jewish gaberdine" for wear in business hours. He refuses to lend the money. Next day the Baron's rich uncle dies; he pays the Chevalier, and they are just going on guard in the duel, when the police, in a very unsportsmanlike spirit, spoil the fun and stop the fight. The Chevalier is arrested as an *escroc* and a murderer. The Baron is excessively annoyed. Meanwhile the Jew has been murdered in a wood. He had been travelling on business, had (with the caution of his race) been displaying a collection of diamonds in a pot-house, and had attracted the attention of two rough fellows who owned an ashen cudgel. The keeper of the pot-house had been struck with the folly of these proceedings, and had got the Jew to leave the diamonds with him before setting off on his journey. But these precautions did not prevent some one from

killing the Jew with an ashen cudgel, and reaping one *kreuzer* as the reward of his crime. Who killed the Jew? *Ubi est ille sicarius?* This is the question which readers may be able to answer for themselves, or they may seek the solution in the pages of the Old Bohemian's book.

"Who Was He; Who Is He?" is a tale of French life, at a rather distant period of the century, and has no very absorbing interest. There is a capital situation in "The First Tear." A rich cynic has fifteen relations, all full of "expectations." He leaves his money to the man, or men, who weep during the first five minutes after his will is read. The competitors are timed with an hour-glass, but only one of them takes up the running. In this story there is an unpleasant and, in detail, improbable affair between a priest and a lady. The Old Bohemian seems to be a rather fierce and credulous kind of Protestant if he thinks this part of the narrative probable or in good taste. "A Psychological Problem" is the story of a *mauvais bibliophile*, a fearful character. *Corruptio optimi pessima*; when a bibliophile is a bad man, he is the worst of men. The case of Don Vincente, of Poble, in Arragon, is well known. He committed many murders, arsons, and other crimes in the cause of acquiring rare books. Black-letter led him on insensibly to bloodshed. Professor Tauber, the hero of the "Psychological Problem," is an *Elzeviriomane*—*duce scelus, auve flagitium*, as the Cardinal said. He is also a humanitarian. He would not crush a wasp, or kill a blue-bottle. He had invented a merciful mechanical hammer which destroyed painlessly the beasts in the slaughter-houses of a German town. A number of mysterious murders (the assassin using a hammer) were committed in this city. A rich baron, a widow woman who had a valuable old Bible, a Jew money-lender, were all found smashed on the temporal bone. It was thought that the slayer must have been a man of enormous strength. But the reader's suspicions concentrate themselves on the humanitarian Tauber. He is finally detected by the agency of a mirror, when just about to make an end of a banker. He made use of a bright steel hammer "which was hollow throughout. At the lower end of the hammer a large bulb was placed. This was filled with quicksilver. On raising the hammer and swinging it for a blow the quicksilver ran through the handle into the body of the weapon, imparting thereby a powerful impetus and great additional force to the blow." Let this awful tale be a warning to book-hunters. On detecting the faintest symptoms of "Grangerism," let them pause before it is too late, and ask themselves whether lead the paths of evil. *Facilis descensus Avernus*, as Ouida says, with much grammatical originality. "Grangerism," as the innocent may need to be told, is the pernicious vice of cutting plates and title-pages out of many books to illustrate one book. This hideous practice is actually recommended by "G.A.S." in the *Illustrated London News*, and he positively proposes to found a Grangerite Society. As the Anti-John Inglesant Society is about to be dissolved (having accomplished its purpose), it might be constituted into an Anti-Grangerite Society. But our argument, like that of Herodotus, is "seeking digressions."

"Expiation" is the most daring of the O. B.'s inventions. The idea of a man's being arrested as his own murderer is not new, but it is worked in a novel manner by the author. He requires for his purpose two men exactly like each other—Armdale and Wilder. Armdale has embezzled 15,000*l.*, which he will have to repay on a certain day. The night before he finds the murdered body of his double, Wilder. He so arranges that Wilder's body is taken for his, and Wilder is "wanted" as the murderer of him (Armdale), while Armdale is afterwards accused of being the murderer of Wilder. Here is a pretty embroglio indeed. The story is almost too grotesquely "sensational," especially at the very curious close. "Eight or Three: a Lucky Toss-up" is in Dickens's Christmas vein. The "Strange Witness" is an excessively remarkable witness who gives evidence about conversations held in his presence, though he cannot hear a pistol shot at a few paces. There are some other German tales, and one excessively Russian narrative, containing things hard to be believed. On the whole, the Old Bohemian gives us plenty, as it were, for our money, and we wish his book success and a friendly audience.

CAVANAGH ON THE NEW CONVEYANCING ACT.*

SOME time ago we had to notice a work on Conveyancing which the coming into force of the Conveyancing and Law of Property Act 1881 went far to render obsolete and unnecessary. We have now before us one of the first treatises which the new state of affairs instituted by that Act has called into existence. Mr. Cavanagh is a writer whose reputation was established by his work on "the Law of Money Securities," and from our experience of that book we were prepared to find in the present one those characteristics of orderly treatment, clear apprehension of principles and decisions, and lucid exposition which are essential in dealing with any subject so complicated and abstruse as the law of real property. We may at once say that these expectations were in no wise disappointed, Mr. Cavanagh's peculiar merits being even more noticeable in his later than in his former work. The author has not confined himself to a mere excursus on the

* *Principles and Precedents of Modern Conveyancing*, 1882. In Three Parts. By C. Cavanagh, B.A., LL.B. (Lond.), of the Middle Temple. London: Waterlow & Sons. 1882.

late Act; he has adopted a far more thorough process. He recognizes the Act of 1881 as a new departure in conveyancing; but rightly estimates that that measure cannot be properly appreciated or understood save with a full understanding of the condition of affairs on which it supervened and the principles underlying it. For neither the Act in question nor the conveyancer's art aims immediately at creating new rights. Their only object or efficacy is to apply or modify existing legal principles. Although, therefore, at p. 3 Mr. Cavanagh presupposes, as the basis of his future labours, "a knowledge of the principles that determine the nature and govern the devolution of property in England," he obviously, and perhaps wisely, regards this presupposition as a mere compliment to the intelligence and learning of his readers, inasmuch as a considerable portion of his work is devoted to a very able exposition of those matters a knowledge of which he affects to postulate; whereby he definitely increases the value of his work, doing much to challenge the hitherto undisputed supremacy in this domain of the standard text-books of Mr. Joshua Williams.

Before going more minutely into the merits of the book, we would pause for a moment to revert to the desponding tone of Mr. Cavanagh's preface. Had his book been a bad one, instead of a good one, the critic's heart might well have been softened by such a wail as this:—"Few achievements, perhaps, yield such small satisfaction as the production of a legal treatise; the labour, as a rule, has been so prodigious, the performance so very far short of the author's ambition, and the chances of success so extremely problematical, that the day of publication brings relief from irksome toil rather than gratification over an accomplished task. In other fields of literature, recognition of downright honest work may, to a certain extent, be counted upon; in the Law, 'glorious uncertainty' is as proverbial of books as of litigation." There is unquestionably a good deal of truth in this. The circulation of law books is small, and new ones are not readily accepted. So the direct advantages of publishing one are, as Mr. Cavanagh says, "extremely problematical." Nor are the indirect advantages—namely, the obtaining of practice by the author—by any means certain to accrue. A barrister who writes books, however good, is frequently supposed to do so because he has nothing else to do; and, as nothing succeeds like success, so nothing fails like failure, or presumed failure. In fact, book-writing, as a means of getting work, is well nigh as inefficacious as the old alternative of going sessions; "manet sors tertia" only, which we need not here particularize.

Turning to the substance of Mr. Cavanagh's work, we find that he divides his subject under two convenient heads—Conveyancing *inter vivos* and conveyancing *ex testamento*—these two divisions embracing all the instruments in which the modern conveyancer is called to exercise his skill and judgment. Each of these headings, again, falls into the apt and natural subdivision of real and personal property.

Mr. Cavanagh recognizes several distinct periods in the conveyancing of freeholds, the most important class of real property interests, as follows:—1. The Common Law period, which subsisted from the time that alienation was first permitted up to the passing of the Statute of Uses. 2. The period which elapsed between the passing of the Statute of Uses and the year 1834. 3. The period from 1834 to 1841. 4. The period from 1841 to 1845. 5. The period from 1845 to 31st December, 1881. 6. The period which begins on the 1st of January, 1882; each of these epochs after the first being introduced by some important statutory provision affecting the transfer of this class of property. This method of classification is distinctly good, and tends to a ready appreciation of the subject. It is open, however, to the criticism that in the ordinary mind it is apt to create some slight confusion as to the existing state of the law. Thus, for instance, at p. 35, Mr. Cavanagh discourses, truly enough with regard to the period of which he is speaking, of the phraseology requisite to secure property to the separate use of a married woman. But all the precautions he recommends are nowadays rendered superfluous by the provisions of the Married Women's Property Act, 1882, and though he introduces this important enactment in what he deems to be its proper place and connexion, still the omission of any reference thereto at the earlier stage might mislead the unwary. Historical sequence is, however, undoubtedly a good rule of arrangement, and, following this rule, Mr. Cavanagh ably traces the methods of alienation of the various freehold estates, from the crude device of the livery of seizin in the case of freeholds in possession and the legal farce of fines and recoveries to bar an entail, down to the latest development for the facilitating the transfer of property. Perhaps the most interesting of all the periods is the second, which begins with the Statute of Uses and introduces the whole system, till then unknown, of trusteeships by recognizing the co-existence of legal and equitable estates, with the scarcely less important innovations of estates commencing at a future date, estates created by exercise of a power of appointment either during the lifetime of the appointor or by his will, and the whole learning of contingent remainders, which may be said to form the groundwork of all conveyancing in the modern acceptance of the term.

The next period, beginning with 1834, is peculiarly fertile in real property legislation, inasmuch as it includes the Fines and Recoveries Act, whereby the cumbrous machinery theretofore necessary for the barring of estates tail was abolished, the Statutes of Limitation and Inheritance, the Prescription Act, and

the Wills Act. It would be impossible within our limits to give even a brief summary of the benefits conferred by these Acts, and the economy of time and money which they introduced into the practice of conveyancing. To the lawyer the mere enumeration of their titles is sufficient to suggest the importance of this epoch, and the uninitiated must be referred to Mr. Cavanagh's pages for further information. The fourth period—a short one, ranging from 1841 to 1845—is only remarkable for a further simplification engrafted on the Fines and Recoveries Act. The fifth period, though a long one, extending from 1845 to the beginning of 1882, contains only one statute of direct importance to the conveyancer—namely, the 8 & 9 Vict. c. 106, or the Act to amend the law of Real Property—which affords Mr. Cavanagh an opportunity of recapitulating the main provisions of the Statute of Frauds in relation to Real Property. This he does very ably and judiciously, blending the two enactments together, so as to present a contemporaneous view of the older one as modified by the later. The period, however, includes some subordinate statutes, such as the Settled Estates Act, 1877, the Vendor and Purchaser Act, 1874, and the Real Property Limitation Act of the same year, some mention of which we should have expected to find in Mr. Cavanagh's dissertation about this point. Perhaps he was in a hurry to get to his sixth and last period, that beginning with January 1, 1882, when the latest development of real property and conveyancing legislation, the Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, 1881, came into operation.

Before, however, dealing with this enactment, Mr. Cavanagh devotes a large portion of his work to the method in which copyholds and chattels real may be transferred or created—his remarks on which he does not, as in the case of freeholds, divide into distinct periods. With regard to copyholds, the conveyancer is not able of himself to effect a transfer, surrender to and admission by the lord forming an integral and indispensable part of the alienation. Chattels real include all classes of leasehold interests; but Mr. Cavanagh appears to have practically confined his attention to the subject of the long terms of years which are, or were, frequently introduced into settlements for the purpose of securing portions or charges, to the almost absolute exclusion of the more commonplace but no less useful instruments by which houses, farms, mines, and so forth are demised for purposes of occupation. In the precedents appended to his work he certainly gives five forms of different kinds of leases; but the preparation of leases forms so important a part of a conveyancer's practice that we wish the author had seen fit to bestow somewhat more space upon the description of their nature and incidents. In somewhat arbitrary contradistinction to the meagreness with which Mr. Cavanagh deals with the last-mentioned topics, he devotes a lengthy sub-section to what he terms conveyances *inter vivos* of chattels personal, a subject which we cannot regard as legitimately coming within the scope of his work. With the exception of bills of sale, there is really nothing in the transfer of chattels personal which calls for the intervention of a conveyancer. The vast majority of such transactions are effected by mere sale and delivery, or by written contracts or memoranda couched in business rather than technical legal language; while even such more complicated negotiations as the transfer of stocks and shares, or the assignment of rights of action under the provisions of the Judicature Acts, scarcely rise to the dignity of conveyances. On page 173 Mr. Cavanagh states that "by virtue of the marriage a husband becomes absolutely entitled to all the choses in possession of his wife"—a proposition which, though unquestionably true at the time Mr. Cavanagh wrote, ought to have been qualified by some reference to the Married Women's Property Act, 1882, which, though not yet in operation, was an accomplished fact at that date. Wills come in for very complete and able treatment at Mr. Cavanagh's hands, while mortgages, unquestionably a very important and difficult branch of conveyancing, are, like leases, rather unfairly subordinated to other subjects.

Under the head of "Conveyancing as modified by recent legislation" Mr. Cavanagh at length approaches the important measure to which his book may be said mainly to owe its origin, namely, the Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, 1881, an enactment to which, however, he does not accord unqualified praise. At p. 257 he describes it as betraying in its very title "a want of logical arrangement which is throughout characteristic of the disposition of its substantive clauses," and condemns its general plan as being wanting in scientific method, and the Act itself as being disfigured by flagrant blots, solely attributable to the apathy and haste with which the Bill was ultimately passed. At the same time he admits that the main object of the Act as described by its author, Lord Cairns—namely, to shorten the present cumbrous system of conveyancing, has been attained by preserving the old forms shorn in expression but not in effect, and supplying by implication a number of clauses hitherto set forth at length, thus reconciling an admirable reform with a wise conservatism. The method by which this desirable end has been compassed is divided by Mr. Cavanagh into six heads:—1. Implication of stated conditions of sale; 2. Implication of general words in conveyances of land, buildings, or manors; 3. Implication of covenants for title; 4. Implication of powers in mortgage deeds; 5. Implication of covenants in statutory mortgages; and 6. Construction and effect of deeds and other instruments. At sufficient, though by no means inordinate, length Mr. Cavanagh comments on the provisions of the Act falling under each of these heads respectively, and appends a short review of the supplementary measure known as the

Solicitor's Remuneration Act, 1881. He then reprints the principal Act *in extenso*, illustrating and expounding it with copious and valuable explanatory notes, aptly arranged under the sections to which they apply and embodying references to cognate statutes and decided cases. The Vendor and Purchaser Act, 1874, the Settled Estates Act, 1877, the Thellusson Act, and the Bills of Sale Act, 1878, are then subjected to similar treatment; and the book concludes with a judicious selection of well-drawn and original precedents of various kinds, so framed as to secure the full benefit of the recent legislation above referred to.

Mr. Cavanagh is distinctly to be congratulated on the completeness and alacrity with which he has executed his task, and his book bids fair to become the accepted text-book of the modern school of conveyancers, and to supplant the somewhat ponderous volumes which recent reforms have gone far to render out of date.

AMERICAN LITERATURE.

WE have remarked ere now on the extreme fulness and minuteness of the United States Census, the completeness of the information it affords, and the care and success with which it enters into the smallest local and industrial details. There is no county or township whose population is not accurately enumerated; no trade, great or small, respecting which the fullest possible information is not given; no subject, of however limited interest, capable of being brought within the scope of official inquiry, the statistics of which are not set forth in the proper place, with a minuteness perfectly marvellous. The Federal Government is, in the performance of this task, hampered by no such superstitions or prejudices as have long hindered, and still in many cases continue to defeat, the emulation of our own census-takers. It would never enter into the mind of any sect in America to refuse a return of its members, or to falsify that return. We are told exactly how many professed members each numbers, how many ministers, and how many worshippers it can seat; and also what, to a single dollar, is the value of its endowments and the amount of its income. Those engaged in every trade recognize the advantage to themselves as well as the duty to the public of furnishing the fullest and most accurate information; there is no such jealousy or distrust as long rendered the collection of agricultural statistics in this country impracticable. Even the one element of political distrust and antagonism, which in other matters so often embarrasses the agents of the Federal Government, is powerless here. The staunchest advocates of State rights find no sort of fault with the minutest inquiry into every particular of State population, wealth, industry, and taxation. Two inconvenient consequences, of course, attend such laborious and detailed investigation, carried out on so grand a scale and over so vast a territory. The mass of figures collected is without parallel in statistical history. The time it takes to gather, arrange, and analyse them, though moderate enough when we regard the almost incalculable number of details with which the collectors have to deal, is inconveniently long. The work is not yet complete; and, from the specimens before us, we should judge that the entire literature of the Census would fill a very good-sized library. Month after month additions are made to the list; and this month we have a volume on Public Indebtedness (1); another on the Statistics of Population (2), arranged by States, Counties, and Minor Civil Divisions; a Census Bulletin on the Fisheries of Maine (3); another on the Iron and Steel Production of the Union (4); another extra bulletin on the Cotton Production of Louisiana (5), with a discussion on the general agricultural features of that State, contributed by a Professor of Agriculture at the University of California, who is also one of the Special Agents of the Census; a volume on the Statistics of Power and Machinery employed in Manufactures (6), limited to the water-power of the Southern Atlantic watershed, and therefore evidently but one of several volumes on this single topic; another on the Production of the Precious Metals (7); and two on the Seal Islands of Alaska (8) and the Oyster Fisheries (9), respectively. Almost every one of these is but a sample, indicating the existence of many others on

the same or similar subjects. Thus the three volumes or sections dealing with particular fisheries imply the existence of some dozen more, and the Report on the Cotton Production of Louisiana suggests the actual or prospective production of similar collections of statistics regarding not only the cotton but the rice, tobacco, sugar, and other industries of each of the Gulf States. The statistics of Northern agriculture and manufactures must of course be even more elaborate, and occupy a yet greater bulk. It is needless to say that no one man, unless it be the chief of the Census Bureau, is likely to master even the totals of all the various statistical tables furnished, that no human life would suffice for the study of the details of a single American census, but that each person interested in any particular branch of statistical information knows where to look for it, if he may not know so clearly and certainly when it will be forthcoming. If not at present, before long it seems beyond question that the publication of the statistics of one Census will hardly be completed before the work of the next begins. We may mention another State document of the highest technical interest—a collection of Astronomical Statistics (10), published by the Federal Government under the direction of Professor Newcomb.

Among the literature proper of the month, not the least interesting are two volumes of very different size and pretensions relating to the constitutional polity of the United States, past and present. Their practical value and general interest is, as often happens, in almost inverse proportion to their size and pretensions. Mr. Scott's history of the Development of Constitutional Liberty in the British Colonies (11), now for the most part embraced within the Union, is exceedingly full and elaborate, but enters far too much into petty details and local squabbles. It would be easy to compile from his three hundred closely printed octavo pages a brief and readable sketch of all that is really worth remembering, of all the main facts that truly constitute the history of that process of growth rather than of conflict, by which the colonies acquired the very large measure of constitutional freedom they enjoyed before the Revolution. So large was that freedom, so little on the whole was it grudged by the home Government, and, above all, so little was it practically hampered by the control of the Governors, that the war appears to impartial students of the history, as it appeared to the majority of the American people at the time, wanton and needless, if not unjustifiable. The story has been so perverted by English as well as American writers, that its real nature is known to very few in either country. The existence of a conspiracy, chiefly confined to a few ambitious statesmen in Boston and New York, to sever the connexion with Great Britain; the extremely reasonable character of the claims put forward on behalf of the mother-country by George Grenville, unhappily in a manner as imprudent and high-handed as the claims in themselves were moderate; the violence and lawlessness of the anti-English faction in the colonies, inevitably strike the reader who comes to the study of the subject with the usual preconceptions both of Englishmen and Americans as a new and startling discovery. But perhaps the most instructive part of Mr. Scott's volume is that which leads up to the Revolution—the story of the concessions freely or reluctantly made to the demands of the colonists, the large amount of liberty they had acquired from the mother-country, and, above all, the outrageously fanatical and often savage tyranny exercised by the colonial majority over all dissentients, religious and political. Whatever despotism there was in America before the Revolution, whatever real injustice was done, whatever cruelty was suffered, came from the hands not of the English Governors but of the colonial fanatics of the same party which afterwards raised the standard of rebellion. For the first hundred years at least of American history the mother-country was the benefactress and protectress of the colonies. In maintaining a strict protective system she was consulting their interests as well as hers, if she estimated both aright. She shed her blood and gave her treasure freely for their defence; and whatever liberty of worship, whatever personal freedom, the weaker party in any colony, and especially in New England, enjoyed, was wrung by English authority from the tyrant majority of the colonists. The plain truth is that the latter were more fanatical, more bigoted, and more cruel than those persecutors from whose severity at home they professedly fled. The persecution of the Puritans by Strafford, of the Dissenters by Charles II., was mild and merciful compared to the persecution of Quakers or other Dissenters by the Governments of Massachusetts and Connecticut. Mr. Scott hardly realizes the bearing of his own narrative, and indeed it needs a knowledge of English history in which he seems deficient, to appreciate the real character of the colonial Governments. His history, fortunately perhaps for the credit of his countrymen, does not include the revolutionary period, does not record the dealings of the rebel colonists with that large section of the population which adhered loyally to the Government under which they had been born.

A more direct and immediate interest attaches to Mr. Ford's Manual (12), intended to instruct the American citizen in the

(1) *Tenth Census of the United States. Statistics of Public Indebtedness; embracing the Funded and Unfunded Debts of the United and the Several States, &c.* By Robert P. Porter. Washington: Government Printing Office. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

(2) *Statistics of the Population of the United States by States, Counties, and Minor Civil Divisions.* Washington: Government Printing Office. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

(3) *Census Bulletin No. 278. Statistics of the Fisheries of Maine.* By G. Brown Goode. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

(4) *Statistics of the Iron and Steel Production of the United States.* By James M. Swan. Washington: Government Printing Office. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

(5) *Report on the Cotton Production of the State of Louisiana.* By Professor Eugene W. Hilgard. Washington: Government Printing Office. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

(6) *Statistics of Power and Machinery employed in Manufactures; and the Water-Power of the Southern Atlantic Watershed of the United States.* By Professor W. P. Trowbridge and G. F. Swan, S.B. Washington: Government Printing Office. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

(7) *Statistics of the Production of the Precious Metals in the United States.* By Clarence King. Washington: Government Printing Office. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

(8) *The Seal Islands of Alaska.* By Henry W. Elliott. Washington: Government Printing Office. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

(9) *The History and Present Condition of the Fishery Industries.—The Oyster Industry.* By E. Ingersoll. Washington: Government Printing Office. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

(10) *Astronomical Papers, prepared for the use of the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac.* By Simon Newcomb, Ph.D., LL.D. Vol. I. Washington: Bureau of Navigation. London: Trübner & Co. 1882.

(11) *The Development of Constitutional Liberty in the English Colonies of America.* By Eben G. Scott. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. London: Trübner & Co. 1882.

(12) *The American Citizen's Manual. Part I. Governments. The Electorate. The Civil Service.* Edited by W. C. Ford. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1882.

general character of the Governments under which he lives. This little treatise, of which only the first part is before us, will be, we think, even more useful to English than to American readers. It deals less with the theory than with the practice of the American polity; with the manner in which the Constitution is worked out in detail, than with those principles of which the Constitution itself affords a sufficiently clear exposition, and on which any general history of the United States furnishes a sufficiently serviceable commentary. The real relations of the different departments of the Federal Government, and the relations between the Federal and State Governments, are not exactly such as might be inferred from a study of the Constitution, even with the amendments of 1865. With the State Constitutions few Englishmen are at all acquainted; and it is on the State Constitutions and their practical construction that the real working of American democracy, the real condition of the American citizen as affected by the law, mainly depends. With the Federal Government he has little to do except as a taxpayer, and now and then as an elector. The laws to which he is daily responsible, which protect his life and property and control his conduct, are those of the State. The courts to which he is amenable, in which he must sue for his rights, the officials who must enforce their decrees, are appointed by the State and administer laws passed by the State Legislatures. How these really work, how the Government with which the American citizen or immigrant is really concerned is carried on, above all how far the democratic principle is carried, and how democratic institutions work in their daily administration, will be better understood from a careful perusal of this little volume than from many much more elaborate treatises. Especially such points as the election of the judges for a limited period by popular vote; the town-meeting, which still forms a very important element of local government in the New England States; the Caucus, now so clearly recognized a part of American institutions that in some States the law interferes to regulate its working, are all well and practically described; and if they produce the impression of a deterrent example rather than an attractive model upon the English reader, that is hardly Mr. Ford's fault.

The Civil War is still the subject of numerous more or less interesting publications. The Life of General Thomas (13) might perhaps be taken as a type of the American military biography, so far at least as Federal commanders are concerned. The continual complaints, the perpetual fault-finding, recriminations, and mutual reproaches, the declaration of superior officers that confessed failures or shortcomings are due to the disobedience or incapacity of their subordinates, the retaliatory invectives of subordinates against their superiors, the personal disputes as to the responsibility for this blunder or the credit for that success, which characterize the volume before us, are almost equally characteristic of all the lives of distinguished Federal generals that it has been our duty to read. General Sherman's biography in particular left scarcely any Northern military reputation unassailed. General Thomas was undoubtedly one of the best secondary commanders in the service. It was, moreover, his good fortune to serve in the West, where the overwhelming strength of the North was most directly felt from the first, and where, for one reason or another, the balance of success inclined from the first to the Federal arms. But his fame depends in the main upon a single brief campaign—that fought out in Tennessee, after Sherman had fairly cut loose from his base, and marched towards the sea. The Confederate Government then determined, as a last resource, to fling the remains of its Western armies upon Sherman's communications, hoping by destroying the garrison left in Tennessee to compel his retreat. But that garrison was, as appears clearly from the work before us, an army far superior to that which Johnston had commanded, still more superior to that which was transferred to General Hood. The decisive battle of Nashville may do some little credit to the victorious general; but its loss would certainly have exposed him to be tried by court-martial, and his condemnation would probably have been approved by the voice of history and the consent of contemporary generals throughout the civilized world. It is clear that his army was enormously superior in number to that of General Hood. Whether the odds were three to two or two to one military critics will judge differently, as they repose more or less trust in Federal or Confederate statements. It was strongly entrenched, was incomparably better supplied, and had, in short, every advantage which resources, preparation, position, and numbers could confer. Only the desperate state of the Confederacy could have excused President Davis and General Hood in taking the offensive under such conditions; only the most signal incapacity on the part of the Federal commander could have averted a defeat utterly fatal to the last hope of the Confederacy. It is naturally an object of General Thomas's biographer to rate as low as possible the force at his hero's command, and to exaggerate that to which it was opposed. But an accidental admission, made for a special purpose, in total unconsciousness of its general bearing, does much to impair the force of such arguments. Forgetting the denials of other Federal historians, forgetting arguments and statements exactly similar to his own, he admits that in battle after battle they opposed 100,000 to 40,000 or thereabouts, a confession which practically allows

that as a rule the Confederate estimates of comparative strength are correct.

Mr. Reed's criticism on the Vicksburg campaign (14) is apparently intended to glorify the Federal soldiery at the expense of the generals in command. It does succeed here and there in establishing a strong *prima facie* case against the claims of Grant to military foresight. It was apparently one of the weaknesses of that distinguished general and his eulogists both in Virginia and in the West to claim credit, not for repairing his mistakes with promptitude and skill, but for having foreseen from the first issues and necessities which to the impartial critic seem to involve the condemnation—at least to demonstrate the failure—of his original plan of operations. Thus, after promising to fight it out on the north-eastern line of advance upon Richmond "if it took all the summer," he finally flung round his army to the south, and after losing 60,000 men, found himself exactly where he might have planted himself at the outset. Mr. Reed renders it probable enough that his ultimate triumph before Vicksburg was preceded by similar errors and similar apologies; but he is more successful in showing how much was due to the overwhelming resources at the command of the Federal generals, and in impairing their reputation, than in exalting that of his special favourites or of the army at large. The truth is that the American Civil War, and especially the Western campaigns, afforded the first instance of war waged with modern resources against the once insuperable difficulties of distance and deserts. With the experience of that war before him, no statesman or general would now hope that six millions of people cut off from foreign trade and without manufacturing resources of their own, could maintain a struggle of four years against twenty-two millions of the same race with all the resources of the civilized world open to them, and with wealth to ensure the command of all.

A more readable volume than either of the preceding is Mr. McCarthy's sketch of a private soldier's life in the army of Northern Virginia (15). The writer served in a well-known artillery company which bore its share in all the principal battles from Manassas to Five Forks; and tells the story of his various adventures, hardships, defeats, and victories, with a lightness of touch which, after the lapse of twenty years, is not incompatible with patriotic earnestness, and certainly renders his narrative the pleasanter reading. No work that we have seen gives so vivid an idea of the peculiar temper and character of the Southern soldier—the want of discipline, coupled with a devotion and enthusiasm which almost supplied its place, the endurance of hardships which at last came to be almost a matter of indifference, the seasoning of experience which presently rendered the soldier careless of every comfort, of almost every necessity except food, of every suffering and toil except that of carrying necessities on a long and painful march. No future historian of the war can afford to leave this volume unstudied; no one who wishes to acquire an idea of the daily life of a Southern soldier or the quality of the Southern armies can well find the information he desires more compactly or more readably given.

Two of those local works, historical or descriptive, in which American literature so abundantly deserves a word of notice. "Graybeard's" sketch of Colorado (16), though only an account of what may be picked up from books or conversation, or seen in a hasty trip through that most interesting of the newer States, is readable in itself, and may be serviceable to any intending adventurer who has not yet decided in what part of the Union to seek a new home. The attractions and drawbacks of the climate and soil of Colorado are pretty well known, as are the more striking features of its extraordinary scenery. The rapid development of its mineral and agricultural resources renders comparatively recent accounts practically obsolete; and in this respect the little volume before us may prove useful and instructive. The *History of Augusta County, Virginia* (17), is a much more elaborate and much less practical work. It is, of course, in great part a history of Virginia, especially in her earlier position as a British colony; but contains also many geographical, political, and biographical details, of purely local interest. That part of the narrative which relates to the Civil War deserves perhaps a special word of recommendation, as illustrating forcibly both the thorough loyalty to the Confederacy of the men who protested most earnestly against secession, and the cruelties perpetrated by Sheridan and other Federal commanders. Northern sympathizers would do well to study at least one such account of the tender mercies of the Union before they again refer to the treatment of the Southern rebels as an example of democratic lenity.

Dr. Brinton's study of certain of the most remarkable stories of North American mythology (18) is exceedingly interesting; nor is its value much impaired by the peculiar views of the writer,

(14) *The Vicksburg Campaign &c.: an Historical Review*. By S. Rockwell Reed. Cincinnati: Clarke & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1882.

(15) *Detailed Minutes of Soldier Life in the Army of Northern Virginia, 1861-65*. By Carleton McCarthy. Illustrated by W. L. Sheppard. Richmond: Carleton McCarthy & Co. 1882.

(16) "Graybeard's" *Colorado*; or, *Notes on the Centennial State*. By J. Franklin Graff ("Graybeard"). Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1882.

(17) *History of Augusta County, Virginia*. By J. Lewis Peyton, Author of "A Statistical View of the State of Illinois" &c. Staunton, Virginia: Yost & Son. 1882.

(18) *American Hero-Myths: a Study in the Native Religions of the Western Continent*. By Daniel G. Brinton, M.D., Author of "Myths of the New World" &c. Philadelphia: Watts & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1882.

(13) *The Life of Major-General George H. Thomas*. By Thomas B. Van Horne, U.S.A., Author of "History of Army of the Cumberland." With Portrait and Maps. New York: C. Scribner's Sons. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1882.

who carries out to its fullest extent the Solar method of interpretation, and finds in every Aztec or Algonkin hero, human or animal, a representative of the Sun. If his knowledge of the native languages is to be trusted, his interpretation of the names of the creative animals of the Iroquois and Algonkin affords a pretty exact parallel to the treatment by most recent scholars of such names as Argus and Lykeus. The white rabbit would seem to be a very near relation of the Aryan wolf and bear. The Mexican and Maya traditions are still more interesting and curious; the more curious that the golden hair, beard, and white complexion ascribed to the founders of Central American civilization, exactly represent the physical peculiarities of its destroyers. Cortez and his companions were actually supposed at first to belong to the divine race whence Montezuma and his fellow-victims claimed to descend—men white and bearded, and coming from the East, to which, according to tradition, they had retired.

Mr. Kennedy's account of Whittier's Life and Writings (19) and Mr. Alcott's Estimate of Emerson (20) belong to a class of critical treatises with which the students of American literature are sufficiently familiar—panegyric monographs, whose object is perhaps as much to display the critical ingenuity and insight of the writers as to do honour to the subjects of their eulogy.

Among the most characteristic and distinctive volumes on our list are several that deal with art, or derive their chief value from the high artistic merit of their illustrations. The recent development of the wood-engraver's art in America is probably more or less familiar to most of our readers, the more so that not a few examples of the same sort of work have appeared in this country. Mr. Bacon's account of Parisian art (21) and living Parisian artists is disfigured by some personalities almost worthy of the professional interviewer; but its text is, on the whole, readable and instructive; and the full-page engravings, for the most part taken directly from the works they represent, would of themselves suffice to render the volume attractive. Fromentin's *Old Masters of Belgium and Holland* (22) comes to us as a translation, but derives a similar value from the very high artistic merit of its illustrations. The same may be said of a new and very elaborate edition of the Poems of T. B. Aldrich (23); and of Mr. Hamilton Gibson's *Highways and Byways* (24), a beautiful collection of the various characteristic points of New England scenery and animal life. For younger or less exacting readers, in a simpler style, and of course at a much cheaper rate, *Grandma's Garden* (25) and Billy Blew-Away's Alphabetical Picture Book (26) deserve a mention. If they have no high artistic pretensions, they will at least serve to interest or amuse for a vacant hour many a little one that will not trouble itself about the text.

Dr. Poole's *Index to Periodical Literature* (27) is one of the marvels of bibliographical research and industry. To test its completeness would require resources almost as extensive and labour almost as patient as those of the author, who believes himself to have registered the subject, title, and place of every article that has appeared in every existing and extinct magazine and periodical of general interest. The third edition now before us professes to bring down the work to the present date. Exceedingly serviceable to a certain class of literary men it may undoubtedly be; whether it can be worth the enormous labour it must have cost, and whether its necessarily enormous size and the unavoidable technicalities of method and arrangement will not tend largely to detract from such popularity as it might otherwise attain, we will not pretend to say. Those who have need of such a work of reference owe no little debt of gratitude to those who have undertaken the gigantic labour of compiling it.

(19) *John Greenleaf Whittier: his Life, Genius, and Writings*. By W. Sloane Kennedy. Author of "Life of Henry W. Longfellow" &c. Boston: S. E. Cassino. London: Trübner & Co. 1882.

(20) *Ralph Waldo Emerson: an Estimate of his Character and Genius in Prose and Verse*. By A. Bronson Alcott. Boston: Williams & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1882.

(21) *Parisian Art and Artists*. By Henry Bacon. Illustrated. Boston: Osgood & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1883.

(22) *The Old Masters of Belgium and Holland*. By Eugène Fromentin. Translated by Mrs. Mary C. Robbins. Boston: Osgood & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1882.

(23) *The Poems of Thomas Bailey Aldrich*. Illustrated by the Paint and Clay Club. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, & Co. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1882.

(24) *Highways and Byways; or, Saunterings in New England*. By W. Hamilton Gibson, Author of "Pastoral Days." Illustrated. New York: Harper Brothers, 1883.

(25) *Grandma's Garden; with many Original Poems*. By Kate Sanborn. Illustrated by W. Satterlee. Boston: Osgood & Co. London: Trübner & Co.

(26) *Billy Blew-Away's Alphabetical, Orthographical, and Philological Picture Book for Learners*. Boston: Osgood & Co. 1882.

(27) *An Index to Periodical Literature*. By W. F. Poole, LL.D. Third Edition. Brought down to January 1882, with the assistance of W. J. Fletcher. Boston: Osgood & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1882.

NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected Communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

The publication of the SATURDAY REVIEW takes place on Saturday Mornings, in time for the early trains, and copies may be obtained in the Country, through any Newsagent, on the day of publication.

Now ready, **VOLUME LIV.**, bound in cloth, price 18s. Cloth Cases for Binding all the Volumes, price 2s. each. Also, Reading Cases, price 2s. 6d. each. May be had at the Office, or through any Bookseller.

THE SATURDAY REVIEW

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

CONTENTS OF No. 1,422, JANUARY 27, 1883:

The Murder League. Lord Hartington in Lancashire. Egypt. The French Proscriptions. Mr. Goschen at Ripon. The Ministerial Crisis in France. Election Expenses. Railways and Commons. The Fire in Windsor Street.

In and About Cannes. Old Irish Ideas. The Future of Cairo. Blessings of a Republic. The Church Quarterly on the Marriage Law. Gustave Doré. Collisions at Sea. Last Year's French Wine Crop. The Theatres.

Samuel Richardson. Korea. Life of Bishop Wilberforce. The Imperial Dictionary. Colonel Malleson's Lord Clive. "Engineering" Series. A Syriac Chronicle. Stories by an Old Bohemian. Cavanagh on the New Conveyancing Act. American Literature.

CONTENTS OF No. 1,421, JANUARY 20, 1883:

Mr. Gladstone—The Circular Note—Sir Richard Cross at Southport—Prince Napoleon and the Republic—Revolutionary Legislation—Three Irish Incidents—Sir Edward Watkin Again—Socialistic Schooling—Crown's Quest-Law.

The Summer Palace of the Great King—The Public Spirit of the Whigs—Fires—Troubles of Yachtmen—Lonely Lives—The Quarterly Review on the late Prime—The Mint—Capital Punishment Abroad—Bank Dividends—Picture Exhibitions.

The Wentworth Papers—Les Egyptes—The Sun: its Planets and their Satellites—Kit-Micoll's Landmarks of English Literature—Wood's Black Forest—The Life and Letters of Francis Lieber—Some Recent Classical Books—German Literature.

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

DORÉ'S GREAT WORKS, "CHRIST LEAVING THE PRÆTORIUM," "CHRIST ENTERING JERUSALEM," and "MOSES BEFORE PHARAOH," each 33 by 22 feet; with "Dream of Pilate's Wife," "Christian Martyrs," &c. at the DORÉ GALLERY, 35 New Bond Street. Daily, Ten to Six. 1s.

ROYAL AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE, CIRENCESTER.
Established by Royal Charter, 1845.

FOR THE SCIENCE AND PRACTICE OF AGRICULTURE.
For intending Land Owners and Occupiers, Land Agents, Surveyors, Colonists, &c. The COLLEGE FARM, for the practical instruction of the Students, surrounds the College, with which it is in connexion, and is a fine mixed Farm of about 500 Acres.
President—His Grace the Duke of MARLBOROUGH, K.G.

Committee of Management.
The Right Hon. the Earl of DUCIE, Chairman.
The Right Hon. the Earl BATHURST.
The Right Hon. Sir MICHAEL E. HICKES-BEACH, Bart., M.P.
Lieut.-Col. R. NIGEL F. KINGSFOTE, C.B., M.P.
GEORGE T. J. SUTTON, ESQUIRE, ESQ., M.P.
AMBROSE L. GODDARD, Esq.
WILLIAM JOHN EDMONDS, Esq.
MAJOR T. W. CHESTER, Esq., M.P.
M. H. N. STORY-MASKELYNE, Esq., M.P.
The Right Hon. LORD LYTTLETON.

For Prospectus of COLLEGE and FARM, List of Scholarships, Prizes, Diploma, &c. apply to the PRINCIPAL.
NEXT SESSION begins Tuesday, January 30.

THE Misses A. & R. LEECH'S SCHOOL for LITTLE BOYS (Boarders and Daily Pupils) will RE-OPEN Wednesday, January 24, at 65 Kensington Gardens Square, Bayswater, W.

CLIFTON COLLEGE CLASSICAL, MATHEMATICAL, and NATURAL SCIENCE SCHOLARSHIPS.—Nine or more open to competition at Midsummer 1883, value from £25 to £50 a year, which may be increased from a special fund to £80 a year in cases of Scholars who require it. Further particulars from the HEAD-MASTER or SECRETARY, the College, Clifton, Bristol.

LEAMINGTON COLLEGE.
TERM began Wednesday, January 24, 1883.
For particulars apply to the PRINCIPAL.

BRUCE CASTLE SCHOOL, MIDDLESEX.—The speciality of this thoroughly first-class School is that it combines the individual teaching (where necessary) of a private tutor with the discipline and esprit de corps of a school. In the Lower School BOYS are prepared for the Public Schools. The excellent School Buildings stand in twenty acres of playing fields; situation extremely healthy. Head-Master—Rev. W. ALMACK, M.A. (Old Marlburian).

SANDHURST and WOOLWICH.
Storrington Pupils passed at the last three Examinations.

Date.	Name.	Order of Merit.	Examination.	Total No. Marks.
December 1881.	Richardson, J. B. (University Candidate, First on List).	1st	Sandhurst	6407
	Wyndham, G.	8th	Sandhurst	6461
	Campbell, H. W.	31st	Sandhurst	5534
	Broughton, Ralph	32nd	Sandhurst	5386
	Forsey, Lawrence	48th	Sandhurst	5307
	Heard, E. S.	67th	Sandhurst	4736
July 1882.	Hills, E. H. (First on List)	1st	Woolwich	8315
	Green, F. Egerton	26th	Woolwich	5149
	Barry, L. E.	29th	Sandhurst	5371
	Fotheringham, W. S.	32nd	Sandhurst	5275
	Bird, S.	33rd	Sandhurst	5147
	Hall, R.	50th	Sandhurst	5046
December 1882.	Cox, F. L.	1st	Sandhurst	5639
	Green, R. F. J.	30th	Sandhurst	5614
	Crompton Roberts, H. E.	63rd	Sandhurst	4986
	Hon. W. Lambton	66th	Sandhurst	4969

At the Preliminary Examinations of 1882, Twenty Candidates were sent in, and Fifteen passed.

January 10, 1883.

G. FAITHFULL, Storrington, Sussex.

DRESDEN.—Mr. H. B. COTTERILL, M.A., formerly Assistant-Master at Haileybury College, receives FIVE PUPILS. Classics, Mathematics, and Modern Languages.—Address, Liebig Strasse 11.

MILITARY EDUCATION in GERMANY.—Colonel B. WILKINSON (late R.E.) and Lieutenant-Colonel W. SHAW (late Garrison Instructor, Aldershot) receive RESIDENT PUPILS for Sandhurst and Woolwich. Militia Officers passed for the Line. Preparation for all Army Examinations. The results of the recent Sandhurst Examinations increase the general score to Forty-eight successes achieved by Pupils in the last eighteen months. During that period the number of Pupils taken (resident and non-resident) has always been limited to Sixty.—Address, Darmstadt, Germany.

STONEGATE SCHOOLS, near LEICESTER.—The Misses FRANKLIN receive BOYS between the ages of Seven and Fourteen to prepare for the Public Schools. They are assisted by experienced resident and visiting Masters. The Classics are taught by a Graduate in Honours of Oxford, and careful instruction is given in Elementary Science. The house was built for the School, and is about a mile and a half from the town.

THE HAMMOND COMPANY ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING COLLEGE, 7 Red Lion Square, W.C.
Principal—HUGH ERAT HARRISON, B.Sc. (Lond.)
Electrical Engineer—FREDERICK C. PHILLIPS.

A Limited number of STUDENTS will be admitted at the commencement of the Second Half of the Session, on Wednesday, February 14.
Applications should be made to the Undersecretary, at the Office of the Company, 110 Cannon Street, E.C., from whom full particulars may be obtained.

PHILIP A. LATHAM, M.A., Secretary.

RADCLIFFE and BROWNE'S HIGH SCHOOL for BOYS, STAMFORD.
The Governors of this School are desirous of receiving applications for the office of HEAD-MASTER. The Head-Master must be a Graduate of some University in the United Kingdom, and will not be required to enter upon his duties until the commencement of the Michaelmas Term, 1883.

The Head-Master shall receive a fixed yearly stipend of £300.
The Tuition Fees are fixed at the rate of £5 per Boy, per annum, in the lower division, and £12 per Boy in the upper division of the School. The Capitation Fees, payable to the Head-Master, will be at the rate of £3 per Boy, per annum, in the lower division, and of £5 per Boy in the upper division.

The Governors will guarantee that the yearly income from the above-named sources, for the first two years of his tenure of the Head-Mastership, shall not be less than £400.

The Head-Master will be allowed to fix his own charge for Boarders, up to the limit of £50 a year as provided in the Scheme—this amount is exclusive of Tuition Fees.

The Assistant-Masters are paid by the Governors.

There is a provision from the Endowment Fund, to the amount of £450 a year in the whole, for Scholarships tenable at the School, and for leaving Exhibitions of £50 a year tenable at some University or other place of higher education. Foundation Scholarships, which provide total or partial exemption from the payment of Tuition Fees, are also attached to the School.

The Head-Master will have the occupation and use of the residence connected with the School, and of a Boarding House adjoining, containing accommodation for fifty boarders free of rent, rates, and taxes. But he will be liable for such internal repairs of the residence and boarding house as are usually borne by tenants.

All necessary substantial furniture for the boarding house has been obtained, and this furniture may be purchased at a valuation by the incoming Head-Master, or it may be rented by him from the Governors.

The Governors request that only four Testimonials, of recent date, together with one or two References, be forwarded by each candidate; and they beg to intimate that any canvassing of the Governors will be looked upon as a positive qualification.

Candidates are requested to state their age and degree, whether married, and if in Holy Orders.

Applications to be sent in not later than March 15, 1883, addressed to WM. LANGLEY, Esq., Clerk to the Governors of the Endowed Schools, Stamford.

Copies of the Scheme may be obtained, 6d. each, on application to the Clerk.

January 15, 1883.

PENINSULAR and ORIENTAL STEAM NAVIGATION COMPANY.

UNDER CONTRACT FOR HER MAJESTY'S MAILS TO INDIA, CHINA, and AUSTRALIA.

REDUCED RATES OF PASSAGE MONEY.—SPECIAL RETURN TICKETS.

Departures for—

BOMBAY Weekly
CALCUTTA, MADRAS, Ceylon, Fortnightly
CHINA, STRAITS, JAPAN Wednesday, 12.30 P.M.
ADELAIDE, MELBOURNE, SYDNEY From Brindisi,
GIBRALTAR, MALTA, EGYPT, ADEN, Weekly, by each of the above departures.

LONDON OFFICES: 135 LEADENHALL STREET, E.C., and 25 COCKSPUR STREET.

HOTELS.

BRIGHTON.—BEDFORD HOTEL.—Facing Sea and Esplanade. Near the West Pier. Central and quiet. Long established. Suites of Rooms. Spacious Coffee-room for Ladies and Gentlemen. Sea-Water Service in the Hotel.
BENJN. BULL, Manager.

ILFRACOMBE.—The ILFRACOMBE HOTEL, on the verge of the Atlantic, with the mild winter climate of Western Devon. Rooms, facing south, overlooking the Hotel Gardens, specially fitted for winter use.—Apply to MANAGER.

CAUTION.—The ANTI-STYLOGRAPH (HEARSON'S PATENT)

is totally distinct from every form of Stylograph, or point-writer, in that it carries a nibbed pen, with points to suit all writers, and thus preserves all the characteristics of the handwriting. It requires no adjustment, and carries sufficient ink for several days' use. Prices: Pocket Size, 2s. 6d.; Desk, 3s. 6d. Pens, 1s. per Box. Fitted with Gold Pen, Iridium-pointed, 1s. 6d. Of all Stationers. Wholesale only of the sole Licensees and Manufacturers, THOS. DE LA RUE & CO., London.

IMPROVED SPECTACLES.

MR. HENRY LAURANCE, F.S.S., Oculist Optician.
PERSONALLY adapts his improved Spectacles at his residence, 3 Endleigh Gardens, Euston Square, London (three doors from St. Pancras Church) daily from Ten till Four (Saturdays excepted). Testimonials from Sir Julius Benedict, Ven. Archdeacon Palmer, Clifton; Rev. Fidd Pratt, Bracknell; Berks; Rev. O. Thorpe, Fekham; Lieut.-Gen. Macmillan, Brompton; the Rev. Mother Abbess, St. Mary's Abbey, London; and hundreds of others. Mr. LAURANCE's pamphlet, "Spectacles: their Use and Abuse," post free.

MORTLOCK'S, of OXFORD STREET, have the Largest Stock and best assortment of DINNER and LUNCHEON SETS in London. Prices, from 21s. Many Special Designs in the Journal, Dresden, and Oriental characters. Sole addresses, Oxford Street and Orchard Street, W.

GRATEFUL—COMFORTING.

"BY a thorough knowledge of the natural laws which govern the operations of digestion and nutrition, and by the careful application of the fine properties of well-selected cases, Mr. Epps has provided our breakfast tables with a delicately-flavoured beverage, which may save us many heavy doctor's bills. It is by the judicious use of such articles of diet that a constitution may be gradually built up until strong enough to resist every tendency to disease. Hundreds of subtle maladies are floating around us ready to attack wherever there is a weak point. We may escape many a fatal shaft by keeping ourselves well fortified with pure blood and a properly nourished frame."—Civil Service Gazette.

JAMES EPPS & CO., Homoeopathic Chemists.

COCKS' FOR NEARLY A CENTURY
Has been the Best and most Economical Sauce
FOR FISH, SOUPS, GRAVIES, &c.
Cocks' Reading Sauce induces appetite, accelerates digestion, whilst its delicious flavour is unequalled.
See Charles Cocks' Signature on a white ground across the Reading Arms.

FURNISH YOUR HOUSE or APARTMENTS
THROUGHOUT on MOEDER'S HIRE SYSTEM. The original, best, and most liberal. Cash Prices; no extra charge for time given. Large, useful stock to select from. Illustrated price Catalogue, with terms, sent free by post. 50, and 52 Tottenham Court Road, and 19, 20, and 21 Morwell Street, W. Established 1862.

LIFE ASSURANCES, &c.

PHENIX FIRE OFFICE,
LOMBARD STREET and CHARING CROSS, LONDON.—Established 1783.
Insurances against Loss by Fire and Lightning effected in all parts of the World. Loss claims arranged with promptitude and liberality.
JOHN J. BROOMFIELD, Secretary.

NORTHERN ASSURANCE COMPANY.

Established 1836.
FIRE AND LIFE. AT HOME AND ABROAD.

HEAD OFFICES—LONDON and ABERDEEN.

Fire Premiums £451,000

Life Premiums 181,000

Interest 155,000

Accumulated Funds £2,708,000

IMPERIAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Established 1803.—1 OLD BROAD STREET, E.C.; and 32 FILL MALL, S.W.

CAPITAL, £1,000,000, PAID-UP and INVESTED, £700,000.

E. COZENS SMITH, General Manager.

COMMERCIAL UNION ASSURANCE COMPANY,

FIRE, LIFE, MARINE.

Capital fully subscribed £2,500,000.

Capital paid up £500,000.

Life Funds in Special Trust for Life Policy Holders exceed £733,000

Total Annual Premium Income exceeds £1,050,000.

CHIEF OFFICES—19 and 20 CORNHILL, LONDON, E.C.

WEST END OFFICES—8 FILL MALL, LONDON, S.W.

THE LONDON JOINT STOCK BANK, Limited.—NOTICE

is hereby given that the RATE of INTEREST allowed at the Head Office and Branches of this Bank on Deposits subject to Seven days' notice of withdrawal is this day reduced to THREE PER CENT. per annum.

W. F. NARRAWAY, General Manager

5 Princes Street, Mansion House,

January 25, 1883.

APOLLINARIS

"THE QUEEN OF TABLE WATERS."

"Mind you put Apollinaris in the Champagne."

Punch, June 10, 1882.

ANNUAL SALE,

TEN MILLIONS.

ÆSCULAP.

THE ONLY

PALATABLE NATURAL APERIENT WATER.

A Positive Cure for Stomach, Liver, and Kidney Affections.

THE BEST HOUSEHOLD REMEDY AND SPECIFIC FOR CONSTIPATION.

DESCRIPTIVE PAMPHLET, WITH TESTIMONIALS, POST FREE.

Sold by Chemists, 1s. 6d. and 2s. per Bottle.

ÆSCULAP BITTER WATER COMPANY, LIMITED,
38 SNOW HILL, LONDON, E.C.

GOLD MEDAL, PARIS. MEDALS: SYDNEY, MELBOURNE, CHRISTCHURCH, N.Z.

FRY'S

FRY'S CARACAS COCOA

"A most delicious and valuable article."
Standard.

COCOA.

PURE COCOA ONLY.

FRY'S COCOA EXTRACT

"Strictly pure."—W. W. STODDART,
F.L.C., F.C.S., City Analyst, Bristol.

SIXTEEN PRIZE MEDALS.

NO END OF WORRY SAVED

By sorting your letters and papers into

STONE'S PATENT BOXES
and **CABINETS.**

Full Illustrated and descriptive Catalogue of Stone's Patent Index Letter Files, Pigeon Holes, Solicitor's Form Cases, Music Boxes and Cabinets, &c. of all Stationers, or post free from

HENRY STONE, Manufacturer and Patentee, BANBURY.

DINNEFORD'S MAGNESIA.—This pure Solution is the best remedy for Acidity of the Stomach, Heartburn, Headache, Gout, and Indigestion.

DINNEFORD'S MAGNESIA.—The Safest and most gentle Aperiens for Delicate Constitutions, Ladies, Children, and Infants.
OF ALL CHEMISTS.